DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 374 534 EA 026 110

AUTHOR Rigden, Diana W.
TITLE Sustaining Change in Schools: A Role for Business. Precollege Series.
INSTITUTION Council for Aid to Education, New York, NY.
PUB DATE 94
NOTE 69p.
AVAILABLE FROM Council for Aid to Education, 51 Madison Avenue, Suite 2200, New York, NY 10010 ($25).
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Business Responsibility; *Corporate Support; *Educational Change; Elementary Secondary Education; Partnerships in Education; Private Sector; *School Business Relationship; School Restructuring

ABSTRACT

Despite the serious efforts of the decade-long school reform movement, there is little indication that American students are making dramatic gains in academic achievement or mastering the skills they need for productive lives. Can companies support education reform in ways that both "make a difference" and are compatible with the financial, human, and material resources they have available? This publication considers how the business community can structure its involvement in elementary and secondary education in order to promote system-based strategies for reform. Following the introduction, chapter 1 describes the need for schools and communities to reaffirm their focus on increased student learning, suggesting how business can help educators define educational expectations. Chapter 2 summarizes the apparent consensus on how to produce better outcomes. It briefly describes the kinds of changes needed in the education system, key strategies for change, and ideas for measuring their effectiveness. The third chapter describes strategies to help schools sustain their capacity for change at five different levels--the classroom, school, district, community, and policy arena. The final chapter outlines how individual companies can identify appropriate actions and develop an effective role for supporting comprehensive, long-term reform. Lists of resource organizations and precollege advisory board members are included. An enclosed handout/poster maps strategies for involvement. (LMI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

EF

COUNCIL FOR AID TO EDUCATION

ED 374 534

Sustaining Change in Schools

A Role for Business

Diana W. Rigden

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

- This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN OTHER THAN PAPER COPY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

P. Lewis

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Precollege Series

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

EA 026 110

About the Council for Aid to Education

The Council for Aid to Education is the only national non-profit organization that focuses exclusively on education and private giving, especially corporate giving. Our primary mission is to inform, strengthen, and enhance the impact of corporate support of education at all levels.

At the Council for Aid to Education, we:

- provide corporations with advice and assistance in identifying and developing effective national, regional, and local programs of education support;
- offer thoughtful analysis and commentary on key aspects of education policy and practice;
- collect, interpret, and disseminate data on educational philanthropy for the funding community, for educators and educational policymakers, and for government decisionmakers;
- act as a source of information and expertise not only for corporations but also for the media, for researchers, and for civic and community leaders interested in private support of education.

Copies of this report are available free of charge to supporters of the Council. Others may purchase copies for $25 each prepaid from the Council for Aid to Education, Publications Department, 342 Madison Avenue, Suite 2300, New York, NY 10017. Phone: (212) 661-5800.

Sustaining Change in Schools

A Role for Business

Diana Wyllie Rigden
Vice President, Precollege Programs

Precollege Series

Copyright © 1994 by the Council for Aid to Education

Acknowledgments

Sustaining Change in Schools: A Role for Business is the third report in the Council's Precollege Series, publications analyzing school reform issues and corporate support of precollege education. The development of this report was made possible by a special grant from the J.C. Penney Co. Foundation. Earlier volumes in the series include *School Restructuring: Designing Schools for Better Student Learning* (1990) and *Business/School Partnerships: A Path to Effective School Restructuring* (1991).

During the process of writing this report, I benefited greatly from conversations with a number of business leaders, educators, and policymakers. Most especially, I would like to thank those who offered thoughtful advice and comments on drafts of the manuscript: Douglas Carnine, *National Center for Improving the Tools of Educators, University of Oregon*; Charles O. DeReimer, *Southwestern Bell Foundation*; F. James Hoffmann, *Middle School Partnership, Champion International Corporation*; Peter G. Huidekoper, *Gates Foundation*; Daniel C. Humphrey, *SRA International*; Martha D. Kramer, *GTE Corporation*; Mary E. Leslie, *Pacific Telesis Foundation*; William C. Linder-Scholer, *Cray Research Foundation*; Phyllis McGrath, *General Electric Foundation*; Samuel M. Matsa, *International Business Machines Corporation*; Sophie Sa, *Panasonic Foundation*; Elizabeth Share, *Autodesk Foundation*; and Bess Stephens, *Hewlett-Packard Company*.

I would also like to thank Arnold R. Shore, *Voyageur Outward Bound School*, for his support and guidance in the development of the Precollege Series, and to Judith Eaton and Priscilla Lewis of the Council staff for their continually thoughtful advice and encouragement.

Diana Wyllie Rigden

Contents

Introduction 1

What Does "Success" Mean in Corporate Education Support? 2
Designing Feasible System-Based Initiatives 3
Where We Go from Here 3

Chapter 1: New Expectations for Student Learning 5

High Academic Goals for All Students 5
Focus on Results 7

Chapter 2: The Growing Consensus on Reform 8

Key Elements of Successful Reform 8
Difficulties Encountered in the Change Process 9
Capacity for Change 12

Chapter 3: Where Change Must Happen: A Portrait of the System 14

In the Classroom 15
Curriculum-Driven Reform 15
- Enhancing Teacher Capacity 16
- Motivating Students for Learning 17
- Ideas for Business Support in the Classroom 18

In the School 19
- School Mission & Learning Outcomes 19
- Leadership for Change 20
- Managing the Change Process 21
- Ideas for Business Support in the School 22

In the District 24
- Support for School-Based Restructuring 24
- Student Assessment & School Accountability 25
- Setting Up Communication & Resource Networks 25
- Ideas for Business Support in the District 26

In the Community 27
- Building Consensus for Reform 28
- Connecting Families & Schools 28
- Linking Social Services with Schools 29
- Ideas for Business Support in the Community 30

In the Policy Arena 31
- Defining Outcome-Based Education Reform 31
- Reassessing Rules & Regulations 32
- Ensuring Adequate Educational Opportunity 32
- Ideas for Business Support in the Policy Arena 33

Chapter 4: How Business Can Help Sustain Change in Education 35

Developing an Effective Education-Support Program 36
- Select Issue(s) to Address 37
- Determine Type of Involvement 38
  - Cash Contributions 38
  - Employee Participation 39
  - Materials & Equipment 39
  - Advocacy 40
- Select Arena for Action 40
- Identify Appropriate Entry Points 41
- Monitor & Evaluate Programs 42

Creating Corporate Policies that Support Education Reform 43

For Further Reading 45

Resource Organizations 47

Precollege Advisory Board 50

Introduction

With the announcement in 1989 of National Education Goals, this country determined that all its children should progress from "ready to learn" by age four to "ready for work and/or college" by age 18. To accomplish this ambitious goal, we created programs and partnerships to support local schools and districts. We held informative meetings and issued persuasive reports calling for "systemic" change. Educators developed experimental reform strategies, many of which are now being implemented by schools across the country with the help of private, state, and federal funds. Governors embraced the national education goals and rallied communities around state education agendas. National standards projects in major curriculum areas are now under way, and alternative assessment options are being proposed and debated.

The business community has tackled national education reform projects through the New American Schools Development Corporation; launched statewide efforts under the Business Roundtable's Education Initiative; and played a significant role in developing education policy and reform strategies through state business/education coalitions. Corporations have also expanded their individual involvement in K-12 education by sponsoring education reform projects and developing local school partnerships.

The decade-long school reform movement, with its strong business sponsorship, provides encouraging evidence that intensive national attention — financial and political support, incentive grants, opportunities for training and development, assorted partnership activities — can foster challenging school and district reform efforts directed toward school improvement. We now find excellent magnet or alternative schools in many urban districts, for example, and can point to schools undertaking major reform experiments within several national reform "networks" such as the Coalition of Essential Schools, Accelerated Schools, School Development Program, and others. We also know of successful independent restructuring experiments linked to specific outcomes defined by schools and districts.

While these efforts are serious and prompt us to feel hopeful about achieving school change, they occur in a very small share of America's over 80,000 public schools and remain essentially disconnected from the mainstream of American education. In spite of the breadth and remarkable tenure of this current reform effort, changes within most schools and districts have been cosmetic at best. Too many schools lack the expertise, leadership, and support they need to transform teaching and learning practices in ways that reflect the best of what we have learned about creating good schools. More discouraging is the ephemeral nature of many current reform efforts. It is rare to find reform experiments that have been sustained and strengthened over time and can survive the departure of a visionary leader.

We must also admit that whatever we have accomplished through experiments in school restructuring, school-based management, ungraded classrooms, performance-based assessment, total quality management, and school/business partnerships, we have yet to see

any serious indication that American students are making dramatic gains in academic achievement or mastering the skills they need for productive lives. In fact, we cannot yet demonstrate that our children are learning any better today than they were in 1983 when *A Nation At Risk* confronted us with its declaration that "the educational foundations of our society" were being "eroded by a rising tide of mediocrity."[1]

What Does "Success" Mean in Corporate Education Support?

"Are we making a difference?" ask business leaders involved in education reform. The answers are ambiguous at best. "Yes," we are inclined to say when an individual student learns fractions after working with his or her tutor, or when the number of high school students entering college doubles as a result of mentoring, counseling, and scholarship incentives available to the school. But what of the larger issues: Why is an eighth grader still struggling with fractions? Why aren't we changing how all elementary school math classes are taught to make sure all children learn basic arithmetic, or will we always need tutors to help older students catch up? Do teachers and counselors unfairly classify students and discourage some children from pursuing high levels of achievement?

So even successful programs in K-12 education raise questions about the extent of the impact corporations can have on complicated, interconnected education problems: If students are not learning what they should at each grade level, is our best strategy to work with individual students? or should we help their teachers? or teachers at earlier grade levels? Do we support the design of new curricula? or help faculty redesign schedules, form decisionmaking teams, alter class configurations? Do we support efforts to develop better assessment tools? or try to improve students' scores on existing assessments? Do we encourage parents to be more insistent on academic achievement? or find ways to intervene on behalf of kids living under extremely disadvantaged conditions? And where do we focus our attention — at classroom, school, district, or state levels?

There is evidence that business-sponsored programs often lead to success for individual students, but we worry that such efforts address symptoms rather than causes. What, then, are those causes? Poverty, social chaos, fragmented families, badly educated teachers, skepticism about students' abilities, outdated materials and equipment, run-down facilities, gridlock bureaucracy, decisions based on political expediency, and stifling regulations, among other things. Faced with such a list, we decide we must work "systemically" and naturally find the task overwhelming. Often the education support options available to corporations — employee volunteerism, minigrants, focused program support — are not even suited to producing systemic change, adding to our discouragement.

---

[1] *From Risk to Renewal: Charting a Course for Reform*, by the Editors of *Education Week* (1993), describes the status of current reform efforts and our lack of progress in attaining measurable results in student achievement after ten years of education reform.

Designing Feasible System-Based Initiatives

Can companies support education reform in ways that both "make a difference" and are compatible with the financial, human, and material resources they have available? In *Sustaining Change in Schools* we consider how the business community can structure its involvement in elementary and secondary education within the broad arena of the education system, targeting its initiatives to promote **system-based** strategies for reform.

We begin by describing the need for schools and communities to reaffirm their focus on **increased student learning** and academic achievement, suggesting how business can help educators address the question, "What do we want students to know and be able to do as a result of their education?" The way a community answers that question determines how priorities are set at the school site and establishes a framework for undertaking the necessary steps to help students achieve academically.

Next, the report summarizes what seems to be the consensus on how to get better learning outcomes, providing a brief description of the kinds of changes we need throughout the education system, key strategies for making these changes, and ideas for measuring their effectiveness. We look at some common assumptions and actions that hinder the change process.

Helping schools sustain their capacity for change is the critical role for corporations, and this report goes on to describe strategies to that end in five key dimensions of the educational system: classroom, school, district, community, and policy arenas. This section of the report, "Where Change Must Happen: A Portrait of the System," provides a map to help business leaders better understand the interactive complexity of reforming the education system.

As we consider what we are learning from reform experiments in each dimension of the system, we identify opportunities for business support, emphasizing that efforts in one area must work in concert with those in other areas. The excellent initiatives directed toward instruction and teacher renewal, for example, or curriculum standards, or new assessment tools, or different governance structures, or strengthened family/community and school relations all must begin to come together to serve the larger goal of redesigning the school culture so that all children succeed academically. This will require changes in policies, practices, roles, relationships, classroom materials, and expectations of students, and will demand a better understanding of how state and district administrators can support school-based change and provide incentives for high student achievement.

In the report's final section, we outline how individual companies can identify appropriate actions and develop an effective role — through partnerships, programs, grants, and advocacy — that will help support broad, long-term reform.

Where We Go from Here

"There is no silver bullet, no quick fix." We repeat the words as a mantra, but too often we really believe the isolated school reform activities we undertake will somehow magically reverse ineffective and inappropriate education practices in schools and districts. Instead, we must

understand that to reach the national education goals we seek, we need to work at several very difficult levels simultaneously. When we initiate school-based, teacher-focused, and classroom-centered reforms, we also must be aware of local realities such as time constraints, lack of resources, faculty factions, and regulatory requirements. Reforms in education policy need to be developed and established in tandem with school-based change efforts, so those policies support and undergird local action.

Having demonstrated a commitment to quality education by staying the course for a decade, business leaders are in a unique position to help guide and sustain long-term change in the schools. Businesses and schools have developed a level of mutual trust over the decade, and can now begin to leverage the changes created in specific classrooms and individual schools by extending reform outward into the district and state. Innovation in the classroom, the central feature of many partnership programs, will survive and flourish only within a supportive and flexible system.

Chapter 1

New Expectations for Student Learning

Most business leaders, when asked, say they support school reform because their companies need graduates who can think well, perform basic arithmetic, communicate clearly in writing and speech, use technology to perform their work, and adapt to changing situations. Achievement (academic and social) is their first priority.

When we consider unqualified job-seekers and under-educated college freshmen, we feel justified in saying that schools have shifted away from, or diluted, their central focus on student academic learning. There are reasons for this loss of direction, of course. The majority of American families no longer seem able to offer the security and support children need to flourish intellectually. Therefore, schools are expected — by the community, by state and local governments, and often by parents themselves — to deal routinely with social problems and the health and safety issues that overwhelm many children.

Given such a mandate, administrators and faculty understandably shift their attention toward custodial functions and may dilute academic expectations in the process. Instead of developing a curriculum that provides students with a solid academic foundation of knowledge and skills, they load the school day with courses and programs that teach self-esteem, conflict resolution, substance abuse avoidance, alternative life styles, parenting skills, wellness, values, and so forth. When educators do not keep high academic achievement as their priority, they may be trapped into trying to meet ever-escalating demands to address societal problems, and student learning suffers.

We do not suggest that educators ignore social problems. Many communities, often with the support of local business, are developing initiatives to address difficult social issues. Medical teams are invited to school sites to provide immunizations and eye, ear, and health examinations for young children during summer months. Special before- and after-school programs provide children with supervised activities at the school site, in community centers, or in local churches. Community and recreational centers create homework study programs with tutoring and special guidance available for any student. Schools host adult education and/or job training programs and provide family counseling opportunities in the evenings. In these ways, a full range of community and social services can work in concert with the school. It is important, however, that they not compromise the school's primary mission: to provide students with an academic education.

High Academic Goals for All Students

Although educators are uncomfortable when others want to define "learning outcomes" (such as what graduates should know and be able to do), communities do hold schools accountable for teaching their children and, at a minimum, should require that all students demonstrate competency in several academic areas at the watershed years (into the fourth grade, into junior high or middle school, into high school, and upon graduation). Goal Three of the National

Education Goals provides an important impetus for communities to help schools refocus on student learning:

> *By the year 2000, American students will leave grades four, eight, and twelve having demonstrated competency in challenging subject matter including English, mathematics, science, history, and geography; and every school in America will ensure that all students learn to use their minds well, so they may be prepared for responsible citizenship, further learning, and productive employment in our modern economy.*

In other words, communities should require that their schools make sure all students perform at or above grade level in reading, writing, mathematics, and science; are able to think, analyze, and communicate complex ideas; can use a full range of technological tools; and have a grasp of national, international, and global issues.

As the 1991 SCANS Report[2] and the recent work of the Commission on Chapter 1[3] remind us, technological revolutions have transformed the workplace, and the way schools traditionally tracked students into a college-bound curriculum or a vocational program no longer makes sense. Entry-level jobs in some industries now require more advanced mathematics, science, and technical skills than most colleges and universities require of incoming freshmen. For example, it turns out that the high school courses required for entering a university pre-engineering program and the high school courses required for entry-level jobs in the skilled trades at **General Motors** are identical.[4] To become skilled tradesmen in construction and manufacturing, students need the same algebra, geometry, physics, and trigonometry they would need for college. In too many schools, however, the school-to-work program avoids higher level mathematics, science, and technology courses; relies on out-of-date textbooks; and centers on preparing students for low-skill service jobs. By identifying the academic skills needed by entry-level workers, companies can help schools rethink their curriculum requirements for all students. With assistance from business and community leaders, educators can help all students master not only a broad range of knowledge areas, but also the thinking, analyzing, communicating, and problem-solving skills they will need for productive lives.

---

[2]The U.S. Department of Labor launched a series of reports from the Secretary's Commission on Achieving Necessary Skills (SCANS) identifying the workplace competencies and foundational skills required of workers in the 21st century. *What Work Requires of Schools* (1991), *Learning a Living: A Blueprint for High Performance* (1992), and *Teaching the SCANS Competencies* (1993) establish a framework for communities interested in defining the knowledge and skills they expect schools to provide their students.

[3]Their report proposes "a new framework" to teach economically disadvantaged children high-level knowledge and skills, pointing out that learning "the basics" will not get anyone very far these days. For more information, see *Making Schools Work for Children of Poverty: A New Framework Prepared by the Commission on Chapter 1*, American Association for Higher Education, December 1992.

[4]**General Motors'** program, "Skilled Trades and Engineering: Explore the Possibilities," begun as a partnership with Utica Community Schools in 1989, introduces teachers and students to the common academic knowledge base required of pre-engineers, model makers, electricians, pipefitters, toolmakers, millwrights, and die makers: algebra, geometry, trigonometry, and physics.

Focus on Results

One way business and community leaders help schools focus their efforts on high expectations for student learning is by working directly with students: reinforcing classroom experiences with curriculum materials, providing access to and training in new technologies, and offering tutoring and mentoring services. But focusing on how to improve student learning also means directing support to developing the necessary systems that surround learning. Earlier reports from the Council for Aid to Education[1] defined four interrelated and interdependent goals for school reform and restructuring experiments. We argued that the foremost outcome — **increasing student learning** — is reached not only by focusing attention on the curriculum and how students learn, but also by **extending the capacity of teachers** in terms of knowledge and expertise as well as teaching strategies. The capacity of teachers is supported, in turn, by **developing effective assessment tools**. Finally, reaching these three outcomes will occur only by **creating flexible systems that encourage innovation**. These four outcomes establish a framework for considering school reform efforts and suggest guidelines for developing effective corporate contributions to such efforts. In part, these four outcomes also provide a better understanding of reform issues and a common language for business leaders and educators to use in developing reform strategies and identifying appropriate avenues for business involvement and support.

In too many instances, reform experiments focus their resources exclusively on improving student learning and building teacher capacity. They often fail to reflect how the four outcomes are interrelated: to increase student learning and empower teachers, we must not only make important changes within the classroom but also must facilitate change throughout the school and district by reorganizing schedules, creating flexible management structures, and developing new assessment strategies that reinforce teaching and learning goals. In addition, to make necessary changes within classrooms, schools, and districts, we will need support from a community knowledgeable about education issues. State education policies — directed toward learning outcomes, equity, financing, teacher certification, standards, and assessment — must institute and support a new system that is accountable for school-based reforms leading directly to increased student learning.

---

[1]The four primary restructuring outcomes were introduced in *School Restructuring: Designing Schools for Better Student Learning* (Council for Aid to Education, 1990) and examined in relation to partnership activities in *Business/School Partnerships: A Path to Effective School Restructuring* (Council for Aid to Education, 1991).

Chapter 2

The Growing Consensus on Reform

When we talk about transforming schools to reach the four restructuring outcomes, what kinds of changes can we identify as absolutely necessary? No one program or method can be applied to all schools, but out of the debates and experimentation of the past ten years, we have reached consensus on a set of changes that will help us achieve these goals. We agree that successful reform must be:

- Based on the belief that all children can learn.
- Focused on student mastery of knowledge and skills.
- Guided by flexible, strong leaders.
- Fueled by comprehensive and consistent staff development.
- Built on school-based management procedures.
- Founded on outcome-based reform strategies with new assessment tools to measure successful learning.

Key Elements of Successful Reform

A school culture that acknowledges the unique needs of students and values academic achievement and student learning is the central feature of schools that successfully educate their students. When the prevailing attitude is "all kids can learn," the school works to ensure that each child has the opportunity and means to succeed. To create such a school culture and extend it throughout the system, key reforms must occur within five distinct dimensions of education:

- Within each classroom, reform focuses on meaningful curriculum and use of technology, the quality of instruction by knowledgeable and dedicated teachers, and student mastery of knowledge and skills.

- At the school site, reform is based on a mission that focuses on student learning and seeks high academic achievement for all students. Reform is guided by flexible, strong leaders who practice school-based management procedures. Decisions about scheduling, the acquisition of equipment and materials, and the use and maintenance of facilities are designed to enhance the quality of teaching and learning.

- District level leaders establish flexible policies and procedures to promote and encourage school-based change and innovation. They develop assessment strategies that effectively measure not only how well students reach high standards but also how well schools educate their students, and they create communication and resource networks for the schools.

Dimension	Focus of Reform
Classroom	Developmental needs of students. Core curriculum & technology use. Quality instruction by knowledgeable & dedicated teachers. Student mastery of knowledge & skills.
School	Mission of student learning & high academic achievement for all students. Flexible, strong leadership. School-based management process centered on teaching & learning.
District	School-based change process. Assessment/accountability procedures. Communication & resource networks.
Community	Building consensus for reform. Collaboration between families & schools. Linking social services & schools.
Policy	Outcome-based education reform. Replacing regulations with technical support. Ensuring adequate opportunities for all students.

- A network of support within the community is evident through a shared consensus for reform that leads to collaborative relations between families and schools and the linkage of community services to school needs.
- Finally, new educational policies are established to scrap regulations that are reform-inhibiting, foster outcome-based strategies with new assessment tools to measure successful learning, and ensure adequate educational opportunities for all students.

Difficulties Encountered in the Change Process

Why has it been so difficult to extend the current national reform activity into lasting school-based change? It may be because we operate on assumptions about how to create change that are not supported by education research or by experience. Among common misunderstandings are the following.

Innovation is equivalent to reform. Innovative ideas and practices are important engines to get reform efforts started. Restructuring projects and reform experiments are a rich source of highly innovative models for renewed teaching and learning. Introducing a hands-on science

approach to elementary classrooms, for example; exploring new management practices with decisionmaking teams; experimenting with student assessment through portfolio and demonstration projects — these are among the many innovations that share some common characteristics:

- Freedom to make decisions, experiment with a number of options, and take some risks.
- Additional resources in terms of money, supplies, and people.
- Release from restrictions and regulations.

Not all innovations end up producing the intended results. But even when a special program does show promise, we tend to claim success prematurely, forgetting that the program exists as an exception to the daily routine of schools. Educators (and those who support them) need to remember that innovative programs only introduce practices that are tools needed for genuine reform — school-based management, cooperative learning, teachers "coaching" students, "hands-on" activities, and so forth. **The long-term survival of innovative practices depends upon transformed school environments.** By pointing the way to redesigned roles and relationships, reallocated human and material resources, and revised policies, innovations can help launch such transformations.

Successful models or pilot projects will lead automatically to change. Innovators often think a great idea, a "model" if you will, will automatically permeate the entire school and/or system and inspire others to change. But we have seen too many promising programs disappear to believe that innovation evolves easily into sustainable change. In fact, commitment to a single innovative program may hamper rather than promote change as it narrows reform options rather than opening schools to the flexible reexamination needed for continuous improvement.

A related misconception is that we can foster broad change throughout the system by instituting innovations at a single point within the system. Accordingly, we establish a pilot program within a classroom assuming it will quickly be emulated in other classrooms. Or we create a school-within-a-school with a selected group of students and faculty willing to experiment with new teaching and learning strategies. We believe that once such a pilot program is strong, we can easily move new practices into the entire school with the aid of a knowledgeable, experienced group of teachers.

In fact, **"ratcheting up" reforms from a single site to a whole school, district, or system happens rarely because we do not set in place structures to support full-scale implementation.** Instead of becoming an instrument of change, the innovation loses its identity and impact as we make the compromises and adjustments necessary to work within a resistant system. Furthermore, in pilot programs teachers are rarely supported in their efforts to try innovative teaching strategies with other groups of students, and they are rarely encouraged by school or district policies to share what they have learned or work with other teachers to develop or adapt new practices beyond their own classrooms. Innovation cannot lead to effective reform when it is prevented from changing the practices and attitudes that constitute the learning environment, or culture, of the school.

Reform projects conceived and implemented in isolation will eventually cohere into systemic school reform. The notion that isolated model projects can add up to school reform may arise from a search for "the one answer" that will improve the quality of education for every student. This thinking leads educators and business and community partners to launch reform programs in a piecemeal fashion, focusing money and attention on projects and activities that address narrowly-defined educational needs. They may decide to supplement science instruction, for example, by offering teacher training workshops on computers, providing at-risk students with mentors, sponsoring "job shadowing" or "career day" opportunities for students.

As with innovative practices, each of these activities could be an effective tool in a reform strategy, but too often such activities are not linked to achieving the academic vision of the school. In isolation, none will lead to full-scale reform of the sort that transforms schools into effective learning environments for all kids. Stand-alone projects — whether curriculum reform packages introduced by the central office or activities promoted by a business-sponsored partnership — usually fail to take into account the interconnectedness of schooling and in the long run they have little influence on how well the school routinely educates its students.

In some cases, introducing programs piecemeal into schools may actually create problems rather than provide reform solutions because special projects can mask the absence of a unified school vision for student learning.[6] And when there is a school-wide reform plan, **programs that are not consciously developed to support the plan distract teachers and students, divert attention from the need for systemic change, and deplete valuable resources (including time and energy) that need to be directed toward long-term reform.**

Changing policy is the best way to change schools. Abandoning school reform programs and projects to promote systemic change through education policy alone may not lead to lasting change either. We know that establishing new policy does not automatically lead to new school operations. The RAND Change Agent Study[7] concluded that it is exceedingly difficult for policy to change practice because **local realities determine what is changed, how it is changed, and how quickly it is changed.** Unless there is both a local will for change and local capacity for change, mandates for reform issued by governors, legislators, professional educators, or broad-based community coalitions have little or no impact within classrooms, schools, and districts.

---

[6] *Transforming Our Schools: Lessons from the Jefferson County Public Schools/Gheens Professional Development Academy 1983-1991* (Louisville, KY: Gheens Foundation, 1993) reports that schools undertaking systemic, long-term approaches to school improvement have produced substantial gains in student achievement. Those students attending schools not attempting any school reform initiative reach lower achievement levels than students in restructuring schools, but they still outperform students whose schools are involved in unrelated, short-term, marginal interventions.

[7] Milbrey W. McLaughlin, in "The Rand Change Agent Study Revisited: Macro Perspectives and Micro Realities," *Educational Researcher* (December 1990), 11-16, analyzes the conclusions of the 1975 study to determine their validity today.

Capacity for Change

To succeed, systemic reform takes the dedicated work of teachers and staff willing to rethink educational priorities and school practices, and the support and encouragement of educators and administrators within the system. It also takes knowledgeable support from community and business leaders, and the thoughtful development of state and national policy that undergirds reform initiatives. As we know from experiences in school reform efforts, the changes necessary to transform schools into learning environments must be systemic — from individual classrooms throughout the entire education system.

We cannot redefine what we want students to know and be able to do (curriculum) without also changing classroom behaviors and practices (instruction) and developing more effective tools to measure how well students learn (assessment). In turn, we cannot change classroom practices without also (1) reorganizing schedules, roles, and responsibilities; (2) realigning decisionmaking roles and relationships; and (3) establishing accountability procedures through new management and governance structures.

Until we can figure out how to get all the parts working together, we will never be able to overcome one of the most daunting obstacles to effective school reform: the problem of "scaling up" from a single working model to a larger context. Most reform programs can point to success in an individual classroom or a school-within-a-school, but extending that success to an entire school or a district, and then from a district to a state, requires flexible management structures that actively encourage change.

To transform school management, we must restructure schools both internally and externally. As stated earlier, we cannot succeed through any single innovation applied to one specific area of schooling. Restructuring requires a renewed school culture that must be created by transforming the attitudes and practices that shape the school's central purpose of teaching and learning; by making changes in school organization, management, and policy to encourage and support such changes; and by redefining roles and relationships within schools, between schools and districts, and among schools, districts, and communities.

In spite of the importance of the teacher-student relationship, for example, it is not enough to introduce effective teaching strategies or to develop innovative and challenging classroom materials and activities. To make sure that all children succeed academically, we must also develop an education vision based on the outcomes we wish to achieve; create a climate of cooperation and support; empower teachers, staff, and students by making information, resources, and services available to schools and districts; and provide a system to monitor progress and refine the process.

School restructuring is a powerful vehicle by which schools can transform themselves. An ongoing reform strategy, school restructuring has two interconnected goals:

- Changing the instructional process to ensure better teaching and learning.
- Changing the organization and management of a school and district to support changes in the classroom.

In a restructuring school, faculty and staff seek to create an "environment for learning" based on new priorities, beliefs, and attitudes. To support their reform efforts, a sort of "permanent flexibility" needs to be established throughout the local and state education system, allowing for and encouraging the acquisition of new knowledge, new instructional methods, new assessment tools, and new management strategies while rejecting the temptation to recentralize decisionmaking when predictable difficulties arise.

As schools undertake restructuring, they are often encouraged to request exemptions from rules and regulations so they can experiment freely. When we consider how regulations can limit the kinds of decisions teachers are allowed to make about what and how they teach, we recognize the merit in this approach. But there are inherent problems with a reform effort that, to be effective, depends upon exceptions from regulations.

Restructuring cannot ultimately succeed if it continues to be an end run on the system. Innovations at the school level, no matter how promising, will not survive without accompanying changes in the district and the state to ensure long-term support and encouragement for reform. **Schools may need incubators to get started in restructuring, but they need new organization, management, and policy structures to flourish as restructuring schools.**

Changing attitudes and behaviors is a difficult, lengthy process that occurs in fits and starts as people develop the capacity for change. Those involved in the change process need the kind of political and material assistance that can often be provided by outside partners. In the next section of this report, we will look at specific reforms needed in classrooms, schools, districts, within communities, and in educational policy. Business can play an important role in promoting change within each of these areas for, while business/education partnerships alone cannot lead to systemic reform, it is unlikely that schools will be able to sustain reform without their support.

Chapter 3

Where Change Must Happen: A Portrait of the System

Earlier we identified changes we want to achieve in five dimensions of the education system: the classroom, school, district, community, and policy arena. When we talk about making systemic change, we generally mean that we have to make changes not only within each dimension, but also in terms of their relationships to each other, understanding that a program or reform in one area will have implications for other aspects of the system.

In the past, business partners have focused on individual parts of the system without fully understanding the interconnectedness of schooling and they have been discouraged by the limited success of their involvement. Almost daily, schools and districts are bombarded by educational programs mandated by the state, major grant initiatives supported by federal and private money, new projects introduced by partners, recommendations for change announced by coalitions. Each of these efforts tackles an important part of the problem, but few attempts are made to align them with school and district restructuring efforts. In fact, one of the biggest barriers to true school-based system change is an unwillingness at any level of the education system to coordinate reform efforts. Schools often have a dozen or more discrete programs running simultaneously, with overlapping — but not intersecting — goals, objectives, and activities. Districts rarely have a clear idea of all the reform-directed programs going on within their schools. And states undertaking major education reform efforts are often sidetracked by parallel (one hopes, not diverging) reform initiatives introduced and supported by federal or private granting agencies.

Those seeking to change the system, therefore, need to think in terms of how an intervention in one aspect of education relates to other aspects of the system. By looking at education change in this way, business partners can better understand how to target their programs and grants to influence and support long-term change. Few companies can make the commitment of staff, time, and money necessary to focus on system-based change throughout the education system; but all companies can be smarter in how they use their modest investment in K-12 education to leverage systemic reform.

In this section, reform in each of the five aspects of the education system will be discussed from the perspective of corporate action and support. The three primary ways companies can take action on behalf of restructuring — through money, human and material resources, and advocacy — are viewed as tools that can facilitate school-based efforts toward systemic change. We want to encourage business to help provide the "enabling conditions" — time, vision, student-focus, leadership, and outside support — that will lead to long-term change. Let's be clear about this: Business-sponsored programs will not reform schools by themselves, but they can be a catalyst for change.

In the Classroom

Transforming the quality of schooling in the classroom depends upon a clear understanding of what students need to know and be able to do in the key subject areas of reading, writing, mathematics, science, history, and geography, and an assurance that all students have the opportunity to learn these subjects well. Educational transformation at this most basic level requires three difficult but inescapable tasks:

- Defining a core curriculum, identifying achievement standards for each subject area, and providing access to effective classroom materials.
- Hiring knowledgeable teachers adept at teaching subjects in ways that invite all students to learn.
- Holding students accountable for learning.

It is not too strong to state that, if we are unwilling to do these three things, we cannot change our schools and the American education system will continue drifting into mediocrity.

Curriculum-Driven Reform

The subjects that are taught in class and the content of those courses are at the center of educational reform. Four underlying principles guide curriculum-driven reform:

1. The curriculum should be directed toward teaching students the foundation of knowledge and skills they will need to lead fulfilling and productive lives.
2. Based on a belief that, with few exceptions, all children are able to learn successfully, the curriculum needs to challenge children and appeal to their "multiple intelligences" (not only cognitive, but visual, musical, movement, interaction with others, and self-understanding).
3. How well students learn their subjects should be judged against standards of high achievement, and when students have difficulty learning, the curriculum must provide for additional support and help.
4. When appropriate, the curriculum should be technology-based so students become adept users of computers and other technology.

Core curriculum requirements are often determined at state and district levels, but teachers should be free to decide on the content of their individual classes and may be involved in curriculum development. Teachers also need to be assured that their curricular tools — textbooks, tests, handouts, audio-visual materials, computer software, TV programs, videos, and so forth — are based on solid research and will promote student learning.

In a number of subject areas, national organizations are developing curriculum standards* that will, one assumes, guide the establishment of student learning goals in states, districts, and schools and will influence the development of textbooks, technology, and other classroom materials. In addition to federally-funded standards projects, other scholarly and professional organizations (the American Association for the Advancement of Science and the National Science Teachers Association, among others) are creating curriculum frameworks and benchmarks to guide educators in developing discipline-based reforms.

While establishing standards is a critical step toward curriculum reform, it is only a first step. Educators will turn to federal and private resources to help them take the next step, into the classroom. For example, we will need to learn through school-based projects and research what teaching strategies can effectively enable students to meet new high standards and what impact such activities in the classroom will have on school and district organization, budgets, and governance.

Content standards will also need to be linked to new assessment strategies if they are to guide reform. Standardized tests measure one aspect of student learning, but since the new standards typically require a new breadth of knowledge and thinking skills, additional measurement techniques must be developed and employed.

Enhancing Teacher Capacity

In the late 1970s and early 1980s, reformers tried to "teacher-proof" curriculum and learned the hard way that transforming the classroom depends upon high quality teachers.

Restructuring schools cannot succeed without the commitment of **teachers who are willing to examine curriculum and instruction with a renewed belief: All students can master this subject and it is possible to help them succeed.** Teachers need to work together to redesign schooling to meet the challenges created by new priorities in the workplace (requiring technical skills, mathematics, and sciences for entry level positions) and in society (requiring an ability to empathize with others and exhibit good judgment). By focusing on what students are expected to know and what skills they need in order to be able to perform, teachers in restructuring schools must identify appropriate curriculum and teaching strategies to ensure successful learning.

Companies have a long history of supporting professional development of teachers through workshops, summer institutes, in-company experiences, and so forth. In general, the long-term effectiveness of these activities has been disappointing, but evaluations of staff development programs are beginning to provide information on what does work:

*Subject-matter standards are being established in eleven discipline areas: the *arts* (Music Educators National Conference), *civics* (Civics Education), *economics* (National Council on Economic Education), *English* (Center for the Study of Reading), *foreign languages* (American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages), *geography* (National Council for Geographic Education), *history* (National Center for History in the Schools), *mathematics* (National Council of Teachers of Mathematics), *physical education* (National Association for Sport and Physical Education), *science* (National Research Council), and *social studies* (National Task Force for Social Studies Standards).

1. Staff development should occur within the context of the school, with attention to the management changes needed to support new teaching strategies.
2. Staff development should be directed toward teams of teachers, not isolated individuals. Teachers will need peer support as they implement changes, and opportunities to work together, often in cross-disciplinary teams, to make sure that all students succeed.
3. Staff development efforts can be used to leverage state and district reforms, highlighting the importance of restructuring schools around teaching and learning reforms.

Another source of frustration for many companies involved in professional development programs is the fact that too many teachers continue to arrive in the classroom badly educated. In spite of repeated calls for reform, schools of education are still not adequately preparing the new teaching force with either content knowledge or instructional strategies to reach diverse populations of students. Significant changes must take place in all teacher preparation programs and better links must be forged between schools and schools of education.

At the higher education level, schools of education should become more closely aligned with colleges of arts and sciences to ensure that teachers are knowledgeable about core subject areas. Schools of education must provide new teachers with an arsenal of teaching strategies and a clear understanding of how to adapt these strategies for their students. Ideally, once in the classroom, teachers should be provided with ongoing professional development opportunities (as described above). Information should be readily available about research-based innovations, and teachers should have time and opportunity to apply what they're learning in their classrooms. With the additional help of peer teachers and consultants, all teachers can become more skilled at presenting curriculum to different students, assessing student learning, and determining appropriate instructional approaches.

Motivating Students for Learning

The best curriculum and teachers in the world will not succeed unless students accept responsibility for their own learning. Whether in kindergarten or twelfth grade, students must arrive in the classroom "ready to learn." They need support for learning from teachers and school staff, families, and the community. Students need to be motivated, encouraged, and believed in, so they are confident they can achieve academic success. Since bored students do not learn, students also need to be engaged and challenged.

Student success depends upon a number of factors within the school that are outside the student's control: quality of instruction, how time is spent in the classroom, how learning is organized, what curriculum materials are used, what attitudes are reinforced. But just as importantly, student success also depends on students themselves. To be "ready to learn," students need to understand they are responsible for learning; they need to develop work habits and approaches to schooling that emphasize concentrated effort, the pursuit of new ideas and knowledge, and the achievement of results.

Business has had great success in working with individual students through tutoring, mentoring, classroom lectures, visits to companies, and after-school activities. These traditional support programs will become more effective vehicles to transform student learning when they are linked deliberately to classroom, school, and district reform goals.

Ideas for Business Support in the Classroom

	Possible Company Involvement		
Focus of Reform	**Money**	**Human & Material Resources**	**Advocacy**
Curriculum-Driven Reform	Support curriculum projects that focus on core subjects. Provide incentive grants to help redesign schools for use of technology.	Train teachers & students on computers & use of technology. Speak to classes on applications of subject-area knowledge. Provide equipment & classroom materials. Advise on reallocation of funds to support high tech learning.	Support establishment of state learning outcomes & advocate high achievement standards. Advocate research-based redesign of education materials.
Enhancing Teacher Capacity	Send teachers to summer institutes and/or graduate courses in subject areas. Fund teacher visits to restructuring schools. Provide minigrants to promote teacher innovation.	Invite teachers into company for job-related experiences. Volunteer as aides. Advise & consult with teachers on how to implement reforms. Provide basic office equipment for teachers. Provide ongoing support for staff development.	Support teaching certification standards for all teachers. Advocate creative reform of colleges of teacher education.

	Money	Human & Material Resources	Advocacy
Motivating Students for Learning	Fund & develop after-school programs in core subject areas. Provide scholarships & other incentives for academic success.	Tutor students in core subject areas to reach high achievement standards. Mentor students in career possibilities & future opportunities. Provide classroom tools such as calculators, networking technology, multimedia resources, etc. Help schools establish home use of computers linked to schools.	Advocate funding for early childhood programs. Support student learning outcomes & high achievement standards.

In the School

A new teaching and learning culture in the classroom must be supported by new daily routines in the schools. Based on a shared vision and led by a thoughtful principal, school-level reform focuses on how to organize time and space, manage personnel and programs, create facilities appropriate to restructuring, and keep communication among faculty and staff open, ongoing, and supportive.

School Mission & Learning Outcomes

For classroom change to be more than a set of idiosyncratic reforms introduced by innovative teachers, it must be guided by the school's vision of student learning outcomes as defined by its mission statement. The principal, faculty, and staff should work together to define the mission or direction of their school. This process creates a common agenda and a shared understanding of priorities, and keeps everyone focused on key points while implementing reforms.

From this base, faculty can determine the best reform strategy for their school. They may decide to join a national reform effort that is consistent with their own academic vision, such as the Coalition of Essential Schools, Accelerated Schools, School Development Program, Paideia, Success for All, or the effective schools movement. Or they may recreate their school based on

principles defined by leading experts like Howard Gardner, William Glasser, Michael Fullan, Peter Senge, and others.

When companies and partners support schools through a mission-defining process, they may sponsor full-staff retreats, purchase books about "system change" for principal-leadership teams and teachers, or hire consultants to facilitate the direction-setting process. In defining the school mission, faculty often find it helpful to start by defining the knowledge and skills they expect of graduates. They can then develop strategies for helping students achieve these outcomes — by redesigning curricula, instituting additional teaching strategies, developing new assessment tools, reorganizing school calendars, and transforming management relationships. They can also consider the implications of these goals and strategies for school libraries and resource centers, acquiring materials and redesigning sites to support teaching and learning goals. The school mission, with its focus on student learning outcomes, thus provides the foundation for reform initiatives. During the reform process, the ongoing monitoring of student learning outcomes also provides the basis for adjusting the reform effort. These adjustments may be modest or dramatic, including sometimes the abandonment of innovations that do not benefit student learning.

Leadership for Change

While it is now routine to champion school-based decisionmaking, we are slow to understand that participatory management works best when directed by a wise, flexible leader with an unswerving conviction that student learning is the primary work of schools. Such leaders can not only articulate the educational vision within the larger community, but also put in place organizational structures within schools and within the district to support a rigorous academic environment and encourage innovation. Promising reforms depend upon the quality of school leadership, yet we do not routinely focus resources on developing leaders, helping them secure support among educators and the community, or making sure that replacement leaders share their predecessor's commitment to student learning and high expectations.

How do principals lead the change process in their schools? In general, and most importantly, they help teachers gain confidence in making decisions that have an impact on curriculum, instruction, and management, and they begin to build an organization that will ultimately nurture increased student achievement. They raise expectations for all students, thereby creating a renewed school culture — changing teacher, staff, student, and parent attitudes toward learning and toward the ability of all students to learn well. In addition, they promote capacity-building for faculty and staff through ongoing staff development and make sure teachers have the freedom and material support they need.

Specifically, school leaders in restructuring schools face three critical challenges:

1. How to redesign the school organization and management to support teaching and learning outcomes. (What does the school day look like? How are student/teacher relationships changed? How should teacher responsibilities be expanded and supported?)

2. How to reallocate money to support teaching and learning outcomes. (Is additional classroom staff needed? Should resources be shifted from textbooks to technology? What kinds of counseling services are needed to support student learning? What classroom and learning center resources are needed?)

3. How to determine how well students are learning. (What information should be collected? How is that information to be used and disseminated within the school and to the community?)

To face these challenges, school leaders need training and support. For companies, leadership training is a "natural fit." But the best management theories dissipate quickly in the day-to-day turmoil of some schools, and partners need to be prepared to strengthen leadership training efforts with follow-up support. Executives-on-loan to schools could provide needed advice and support as principals manage the change process, and districts could establish leadership teams of principals to enable them to learn from each other's experiences.

Managing the Change Process

Ideally, school management practices are linked directly to teaching and learning. As teams of faculty and staff define the school's mission and begin to develop a strategy to fulfill this mission, they also begin to identify the kind of school environment needed to support the reforms envisioned. For example, a school may adopt a learning goal such as, "all children understand certain science concepts and can carry out investigative experiments to provide the foundation for understanding these concepts." What kind of school environment would be necessary to achieve this goal?

First, teachers will need research-based information on teaching and learning; they will need to understand the investigative process through their own experience; and they will need latitude to experiment with different approaches to teaching science. Teachers need time together to decide what to teach (content), how to teach it (classroom experiences), what tools to teach it with (classroom equipment and materials), and how to assess learning (exhibitions of mastery). Teachers also will need to develop out-of-school assignments to reinforce classroom experiences. For such science classes to be successful, school days may need to be organized so that adequate time is available for investigation-based learning. Faculty may decide to coordinate science concepts with other courses, which may lead to team teaching and joint projects. Schools will need to realign budgets to provide new resources for science courses and ongoing staff development for teachers in science concepts as well as in the teaching of science. Finally, schools will need to establish a system of accountability to ensure that all students have the opportunity to learn science and are, in fact, achieving at high levels in science classes. In this way, the academic goals identified in a school's mission shape roles and relationships within schools, change the ways school are organized and managed, and influence the process by

which teachers and ultimately schools are held accountable for student learning. Thus, in the three critical areas of decisionmaking, organizing, and assessing, school leaders typically must redesign management procedures to institutionalize the restructuring process.

School-based management/shared decisionmaking, a fairly radical reform when introduced in the early 1980s, is now a common tool for renewing the school environment. A school-based management team in a restructuring school will have to tackle a wide range of decisions driven by student learning goals — establishing the teacher/student ratios, setting the number of hours devoted to various content areas, determining how classrooms are designed, and coordinating teachers' work together in classrooms and on committees. Other concerns driven by achieving school goals include how long students spend in a specific class, how well teachers get to know and interact with students, how textbooks and technology are selected, how days and weeks are arranged to allow time for planning and review. In these ways, school-based management teams, often with parent and community members, determine priorities and establish practices and policies at the school site. Many corporations provide

Ideas for Business Support in the School

	Possible Company Involvement		
Focus of Reform	**Money**	**Human & Material Resources**	**Advocacy**
School Mission & Learning Outcomes	Host retreats for full staff.	Facilitate regularly-scheduled workshops. Provide books, videos, consultants, and other resources.	Promote student learning outcomes. Advocate high achievement standards.
Leadership for Change	Send administrators to summer institutes & training programs. Host follow-up workshops for administrators.	Train staff in defining mission and goals, developing strategic and implementation plans. Provide consultants and advisors to principals and district leaders.	Support school leaders at school board meetings.

	Money	Human & Material Resources	Advocacy
Managing the Change Process	Sponsor management training workshops for teachers & administrators. Provide implementation & incentive grants for school-based management reforms. Fund site visits for teachers & administrators to reforming schools.	Provide on-site consultants & advisors to help faculty, staff, & administrators develop new management styles. Volunteer to assist & support school-based councils. Set up computer networks for management. Facilitate development of self-evaluation tools to assess progress. Help develop communication strategy to inform community on new structures.	Advocate school-based decision-making. Advocate school-based control of funding & budget.

training and financial and technical support for teams of teachers and staff implementing school-based management procedures.

To keep reform efforts on target, some school teams have developed self-evaluation systems to assess and codify progress. The **Pacific Telesis Foundation,** working with teaching and administrative representatives from all its Education for the Future schools, developed Continuous Improvement Continuums in seven categories: student achievement, leadership, information and analysis, quality planning, professional development and management, continuous improvement and evaluation, and partnership development. Each school uses these rubrics to measure the impact of their reform efforts on the school community and on student achievement. From such a self-assessment, schools can identify next steps toward reaching their reform goals.

In the District

Reforms introduced in classrooms or at school sites cannot be maintained long-term without the active support and encouragement of district leaders. While rhetorical support from the superintendent and school board commonly accompanies reform initiatives, schools are often frustrated by what they perceive as barriers that hamper their efforts. Too often, promising school-based restructuring is side-tracked by conflicting political agendas and private interests within the district and community.* In traditionally organized large school districts, parallel divisions — curriculum and instruction, special education, professional development, testing and assessment, finance, community services, and so forth — jealously guard their authority against the requirements of school-based change. In such districts, day-to-day realities contradict even the most highly-touted reform policies. Teachers are not permitted to select textbooks in spite of reform policies mandating changes in curriculum, teaching, and learning. Principals and faculty do not control school budgets and so cannot match spending to newly-defined educational priorities, and school-based decisionmaking teams must work within imposed schedules, building hours, "set time" requirements for certain subject areas, and other restrictions.

To avoid contradictions between practice and policy, the central administration needs to ensure that reforms are built into training procedures, regulations, staffing, and budgeting.

Support for School-Based Restructuring

For the reform process to take root and thrive at the school site, district leaders must consciously make decisions that shift to principals and their schools both the authority to mandate change and the power to implement change. Generally speaking, district leaders need to concentrate their efforts on those schools facing problems with reform efforts, and provide the maximum amount of freedom to other schools, offering technical assistance to support the decisionmaking role of faculty and administrators at those school sites. In practical terms, this means that the district forgoes its traditional role as interpreter, telling schools how to comply with federal and state regulations, and becomes a facilitator, offering resources and technical support to reforming schools. In a restructuring district, the central office would make sure that all schools receive information about state reform initiatives but leave it to school-based management teams to determine how the reforms will be implemented in keeping with the school's academic mission.

Classroom-based changes in curriculum and instruction require comprehensive staff development programs that help build the capacity of faculty not only to teach their content areas but also to take greater responsibility for attitudes, decisions, and practices within their schools. As we have seen, local schools and partnerships often sponsor content-based,

*See the Public Agenda Foundation's report, *Divided Within, Besieged Without: The Politics of Education in Four American School Districts* (1993), which describes damaging turf battles that gridlock, if not derail, promising reform efforts in four diverse school districts.

instructional, and management training for teachers and principals, but the district is ultimately responsible for making sure that money is directed toward appropriate, ongoing staff development directly linked to school-based reform initiatives.

Jefferson County, Kentucky, serves as a model for the kind of district-wide professional development center we might envision for all school districts. The **JCPS/Gheens Professional Development Academy** links staff development to systemic school improvement. To support new approaches to teaching and school governance, the Academy sponsors workshops and seminars, provides teachers with access to state and national meetings, and trains new teachers in 24 Professional Development Schools.

Student Assessment & School Accountability

Restructuring districts help schools develop performance-based assessment strategies that measure how well students master academic material and skills. Everyone in the reform process needs to know what the goals are and how they will be reached. They need to know the criteria by which progress toward the goals is to be measured, and how consistently the goals are being reached. This information influences the continuing evolution of the restructuring process, tells parents how their child measures up against the standard, and assures employers and colleges that graduates have successfully completed a course of study and are ready for work and/or for higher education.

District leaders will also monitor the reform process in schools, to provide the feedback necessary for the further development and progress of restructuring. While school accountability has to be part of the reform equation, in a restructured system no single entity can simply sit in judgment of others; all must stand in support of each other. Although it is the site of authority, the district no longer has a controlling role, but instead provides information and guidance to facilitate change, regularly reporting on progress to teachers, parents, school boards, and the general public.

One of the biggest barriers to meaningful district and school accountability is the way school data are collected, analyzed, used, and stored. An opportunity exists for corporate partners to help districts establish new systems for data collection — monitoring student achievement in relation to student learning outcomes, in relation to individual teachers, and in comparison to previous years and to other students — and for conducting data analyses that can assist in planning and implementing reform.

Setting Up Communication & Resource Networks

Maintaining open communication within the educational system is critical to the success of school restructuring. School-based management has helped diminish the isolation teachers feel within their classrooms, but there remains a growing sense of separation between faculty and administrators. Teachers report learning about education reform initiatives through newspaper stories rather than from school and district leaders, and there is rarely a systematic way for teachers within the district (or from other districts) to learn from each other's reform-

Ideas for Business Support in the District

Focus of Reform	Possible Company Involvement		
	Money	**Human & Material Resources**	**Advocacy**
Support for School-Based Restructuring	Host board retreats to develop district reform plan. Help establish focused staff development program.	Provide consultants to work with district leaders. Serve on superintendent's reform advisory boards.	Support school-based reforms leading to high student achievement. Support school-board policies designed to institutionalize continuous improvement.
Student Assessment & School Accountability	Support comparative studies and visits with other districts.	Consult, advise, and help set up data collection and analysis systems to track student achievement. Help district analyze individual school needs in implementing reforms.	Advocate school & faculty accountability linked with financial & technical support.
Setting Up Communication & Resource Networks	Survey faculty, staff, students, & parents about in-district communication. Help establish district-wide resource network.	Help develop communication plans within districts, between schools and families, and with general public. Provide necessary technical support communication strategies — telephones, copy machines, faxes, modems, etc.	Encourage board communication with public on reform vision.

related experiences.

District leaders can remedy this lack of communication by consciously promoting routine interactions with and among school faculty and staff. For example, district leaders could undertake regular on-site visits, invite teachers to serve on district-wide advisory panels, and create electronic mail links among all administrators and teachers throughout the school system. They could establish a communication and resource network, possibly tied to a professional development center, that encourages schools and teachers to share information on promising strategies and to experiment with new teaching and management practices. They could also provide access to information databases through Internet or other national networks.

To protect school restructuring efforts, district leaders must also become actively and positively engaged within the larger community, meeting routinely with local elected officials to discuss budget allocations and education policy, advocating community and business support of the schools, and articulating the district's education vision within the context of state and national goals. District leaders could host "town meetings" on education issues for parents and community members as a way of sharing information and encouraging participation. By keeping local media informed on education issues, the superintendent can also help the general public become more knowledgeable about school reform and other educational initiatives within the system.

In the Community

There is a growing recognition that in order to reach our national education goals, the changes we make within classrooms, schools, and districts must be better supported by and connected to the community through a shared consensus around education issues, closer collaboration between families and schools, and links with social service agencies and other community resources. Many argue that in order to really improve the quality of schooling each student receives, we need to change the value structure of the society within which schooling takes place, changing the attitudes and behaviors of families as well as the larger community. Whole-scale societal change requires a kind of leadership that is unlikely to emerge from the educational system, but there are ways in which education reform can influence and strengthen the community renewal that will, in turn, support schools in achieving their vision.

As a start, school leaders can develop outreach and support programs with families and the larger community, using the development of an outcome-oriented school mission as the catalyst. Parents and business or community partners could be invited to join teachers and students on school improvement teams, identifying academic goals for the year and devising plans for reaching them. Directors of community service agencies could work with school and district representatives to coordinate some of the interactions with students and their families. And local companies could reinforce the educational mission, as articulated by school and district leaders to the community, through hiring and promotion practices.

Building Consensus for Reform

Growing out of the country's commitment to reach the national education goals by the year 2000, ambitious projects are under way to establish educational standards in major content areas and to develop new assessment tools to measure student learning. These efforts, described earlier, provide a national framework for local communities to build consensus on what their schools should accomplish. In many communities, business leaders already play a pivotal role in creating statewide and community-wide consensus for education reform. The business community in St. Louis, Missouri, for example, was instrumental in helping form the **St. Louis Regional Educational Partnership** and building consensus around its three major goals: to increase student learning, to facilitate the integration of community social service agencies with schools and families, and to strengthen the education and professional development of teachers and administrators. The St. Louis experience is not exceptional, and business and community leaders in cities and states across the country understand the need for collaboration and coalition-building to create a power base that can strengthen and coordinate activities in support of educational reform.

Town meetings, business/education conferences, and "brown bag lunches" have all been vehicles for helping communities reach consensus on a vision for public education. When the community as a whole is invited to participate in defining education goals, a shared commitment to reform can be established and no special interest group will feel compelled to attack another's plan. With a renewed focus on educational excellence, the entire community can be engaged in supporting the efforts of individual schools, raising funds for special projects at all schools, developing opportunities outside school for students, and creating better relations between parents and the school system as a whole.

Connecting Families & Schools

The changes to teaching and learning described earlier in this report are taking place in many schools across the country. But in order for students to succeed academically, their experiences within the classroom must be supported and nurtured by family and community values that promote learning and achievement. Educational research consistently shows that when parents actively collaborate with schools in the education of their children, there is a marked improvement in student achievement.

Many reform programs, in their third and fourth years, are still describing parental involvement as a goal to be reached, not a reality. One exemplary effort, the **Family/School Collaboration Project,** provides a model of how schools can take action to change the relationship between schools and families. Created by the Ackerman Institute of Family Therapy in New York City and supported by private and corporate grants, the Family/School project provides a framework for integrating family/school collaboration into all major school improvement efforts by transforming routine parent/teacher conferences into focused meetings where all parties, including the child, participate in solving problems and setting goals and priorities. A central component of the project is to train teachers, counselors, social workers, and

principals in how to build a collaborative school climate through non-blaming dialogue and a shared sense of purpose.

Other reform efforts seek to involve parents in school governance. The **School Development Program** (developed at the Yale University Child Study Center by James Comer), for example, centers on new governance structures through School Planning and Management teams and Mental Health teams, each including parent members. These teams, together with a Parent Program that encourages parents to volunteer in the classroom, create a renewed school climate of consensus, positive reinforcement, and collaboration.

As these examples suggest, parent involvement must be specifically linked to outcomes to be effective. Of course, individual teachers can help parents better understand how they might support their child's learning at home by maintaining routine phone contact, providing translations for non-English-speaking parents at meetings and in written communications, creating parent/teacher study groups focused on educational issues and classroom topics, and assigning special activities for children to complete at home with family interaction.

Linking Social Services with Schools

Many families in rural and urban communities would benefit from a network of social services located at or near the school site. Districts across the country are experimenting with collaborative arrangements with public and private agencies to provide a number of services, including child care, counseling, literacy assistance, adult education, job training, and health care. In some communities, preschool and early learning programs like Head Start are being strengthened by company-sponsored links with health, nutrition, housing, and other social service programs. Some companies support state and community early learning programs that also teach parenting skills from prenatal through school age. Many communities are basing health clinics, adult education and GED classes, advice and counseling on housing and employment, and other social services right at the local school site.[10]

[10] Collaborative strategies for community-based organizations and educators are described in *Together We Can: A Guide for Crafting a Profamily System of Education and Human Services*, by Atelia I. Melaville and Martin J. Blank. Report # PIP 93-1103. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1993.

Ideas for Business Support in the Community

Focus of Reform	Possible Company Involvement		
	Money	**Human & Material Resources**	**Advocacy**
Building a Consensus for Reform	Sponsor town meetings to discuss education issues. Sponsor special education supplements in newspaper.	Canvas community to identify educational needs & priorities. Establish community-wide coalitions for education.	Advocate for high quality community programs to support learning, especially in core subjects: reading, science, math, and technology.
Connecting Families & Schools	Host functions to create bonds between schools & families.	Advise employee-parents on ways to support learning. Help families create space & time for school-related activities. Help schools develop creative ways to communicate & collaborate with families.	Advocate family-centered policy.
Linking Social Services With Schools	Support programs to train parents as child's first teacher. Provide incentive grants to encourage agency cooperation. Support community-based centers for child care, teenagers, adult literacy.	Help develop volunteer and community service programs for students. Serve as mentors for students participating in social programs (drug & violence awareness, etc.). Institute preschool and day care centers at or near school sites.	Promote close ties between health and social agencies & school boards. Lobby for funding for early childhood & health care programs.

In the Policy Arena

The larger context within which education reform occurs is the political, or policy, arena. Innovative instructional methods or special projects in classrooms and schools can be effective tools leading to school-based reform if they reinforce and are reinforced by state reform policies. At present, the education system in this country, from local schools to state departments of education, often seems to be a jumble of policies and regulations at odds with the practices of fiercely independent power centers.

Among many positive changes occurring at the state level, however, we see boards of education establishing outcome-based education reform (under a variety of names) and reassessing the appropriateness of rules and regulations that affect teacher certification, graduation requirements, curriculum decisions, and so forth. State legislatures (with or without pressure from the courts) are attempting to ensure adequate educational opportunities for all students. In response to such changes, state departments of education are redefining their roles in terms of facilitating reform within districts and schools rather than concentrating on how well districts comply to rules and regulations.

We can see evidence that states are beginning to conceive of regulations as guidelines that will provide incentives and models for local schools and districts. With a clearer vision of what outcomes schools seek for their graduates, state education leaders can become more closely engaged with districts, offering technical assistance, monitoring, and feedback.

Defining Outcome-Based Education Reform

Many states have begun to define a broad educational vision, called variously outcome-based education, world-class education, and quality education. In most cases, the states are attempting to create and adopt flexible policies that support and encourage change within schools so that through local implementation, states can achieve their basic goal — that all students acquire high-level knowledge and skills. In Connecticut, for example, the Commission on Educational Excellence is charged with developing the state reform agenda based on the Connecticut Common Core of Learning. Mandated by the legislature and funded by the business community as well as the state, the Commission is co-chaired by the state commissioner of education and a prominent CEO, and includes teachers, school administrators, union representatives, parents, legislators, business leaders, and state officials.

Some state departments of education are undertaking major internal reforms to change their relationships to schools and districts. In Virginia, for example, a network of regional representatives works with local districts to facilitate curricular, instructional, and governance changes necessary to achieve high quality education. The representatives help schools line up the training and professional development they need to implement reforms, provide technical assistance and consulting throughout the reform process, and help link local schools with companies in business/school partnerships. This kind of statewide redesign can evolve from a

clearly delineated educational vision for the state and a commitment by state leaders to build the capacity for change into every level of the system.

Although identifying student learning outcomes seems a natural responsibility of state-level agencies, in several states local groups feel threatened by the process. Business and community leaders can help keep the debate focused on learning outcomes by creating forums to involve the general public and by helping to expand the dialogue on reform.

Reassessing Rules & Regulations

As we have said elsewhere, restructuring will not ultimately succeed if it continues to be an end run around the system's rules and regulations. But an over-regulated system can become unnavigable. Because of uncoordinated reform programs and idiosyncratic reporting systems, for example, school personnel are often required to prepare as many as four or five "school improvement plans" to meet not only state and district requirements but also the expectations of state, federal, or private grant programs. If exceptions and exemptions are not to become the rule, what is to be done?

Although they may complicate school practices, there are some rules and regulations that are inviolable: those that protect the health and welfare of students, for example, or those directed toward ensuring racial integration and equitable education opportunities for all students. But with the exception of rules that are essential to student health and welfare, and in spite of powerful political interests vested in many state and federal regulations, educators and policymakers must begin to streamline and simplify the operation of school systems. State departments of education need to rethink their internal organization and management with the goal of eliminating overlapping divisions and coordinating statewide networks of support (including funding, staffing, and technical advice) for school and district reform initiatives.

Once student learning outcomes are clearly defined, states should no longer need to spend so much time and energy issuing mandates; instead, they must create systems that encourage local schools and districts to direct and monitor their own reform efforts to meet the new standards. Funding priorities should reflect this new approach, with program-specific funding (which often subjects schools to detailed, duplicative, and contradictory regulations) giving way to support for whole-school change. Incentive grants for good schools would eliminate the contradiction inherent in many current funding systems, which provide additional aid only for schools with poor records, "punishing" successful schools by withdrawing extra funds.

Ensuring Adequate Educational Opportunities

Clauses in state constitutions require all schools to offer a basic minimum standard of education. In some cities and states, however, students do not have textbooks or must use books that date from the Nixon administration. Their teachers are inadequately educated; their schools and classrooms are dirty, ill-equipped, even hazardous. Jonathan Kozol's *Savage Inequalities* (1991) described the desperate conditions in some schools and districts.

Ideas for Business Support in the Policy Arena

Focus of Reform	Possible Company Involvement		
	Money	**Human & Material Resources**	**Advocacy**
Establishing Outcome-Based Education Reforms	Provide incentive grants for implementing reforms.	Help schools & districts develop implementation plans for outcome-based reforms. Link partnership programs to outcome-based reform strategies.	Advocate outcome-based education reform in community & company. Support accompanying legislation & state funding for reform.
Reassessing Rules & Regulations	Fund research on effective implementation of reform.	Help school councils identify regulations that hinder change and "run interference" for them at district and state levels.	Lobby for legislative changes to shift from program focus to school-based efforts.
Ensuring Adequate Educational Opportunities	Fund an assessment of schools' physical needs. Provide matching funds for repairs & upgrades. Help schools meet matching fund requirements for state equipment grants.	Volunteer time to rewire, repair, rebuild classrooms & schools. Manage volunteer repair & maintenance effort. Help communicate physical plant needs to community. Provide technological equipment & distance learning capability.	Advocate & lobby for tax levies earmarked for plant improvements. Support changes in school maintenance contracts. Lobby legislature for building fund allocations.

In addition to rectifying these gross inequities, we will need to make major changes in school facilities to accommodate even modest restructuring reforms.[11] While it is not feasible that all schools have equal facilities, states and districts will need to ensure that all schools meet a minimum standard for excellence in educational opportunity. Facilities must complement the kind of teaching and learning that will go on in restructuring schools. For example, classrooms need to be wired for computers, printers, and modems and linked with national databases and networks. Classrooms must encourage flexible arrangements that support both cooperative learning (work stations, storage space, movable chairs and tables) and the professional capacity of teachers (space for student portfolios, instructional research studies, reference books, phones, private desk).

To accommodate ongoing, extensive staff development, schools will need dedicated training space with appropriate electrical outlets and equipment. Space is also required for effective parent involvement, tutor and mentor interactions with students, and additional counselors, health care, and social service providers. Companies can help schools better assess their physical capacity for restructuring and systemic reform and pressure state legislatures to reconsider funding allocations so that money is earmarked for renovating and maintaining the schools.

[11]Joe Schneider's essay "Can the Schoolhouse Handle Systemic Reform?" provided much of the background for this section. See *Education Week* (June 6, 1993), pages 36, 29.

Chapter 4

How Business Can Help Sustain Change in Education

Restructuring experiments take money, time, and energy and cannot succeed without additional funds, long hours of work, and supplementary classroom and school resources. At each level of the education system, we have described how business and community partnership activities and policies can undergird the reform process. After ten years of supporting education reform, companies are at very different stages in their involvement with schools and districts. Some companies are exploring ways to respond to local education needs, others are expanding their commitment from project support to school-based restructuring efforts, and still others are reassessing existing programs to change the focus, approach, and/or depth of their commitment. At whatever stage a company finds itself, some basic principles can guide the development of effective business/school interaction.

Knowledge of education issues is essential. Corporate leaders engaged in supporting K-12 education should be familiar with basic reform issues. They need to understand the traditional practices and beliefs schools are attempting to change, how changes are being undertaken, what has been and is being learned from reform efforts across the country, and what kinds of results can realistically be anticipated. Without such knowledge, business partners run the risk of being distracted from focusing on reform outcomes.

Knowledge of the local education context must guide company involvement. School restructuring is an effort to change already-existing systems, and business leaders need to recognize that the status quo is probably working for many people, often those with power and authority, who may not see the need for any kind of change. A company will waste time, resources, and energy if it attempts a reform-model partnership with a school or district unwilling to consider changing teaching and learning practices.

Educators are critical to reform programs sponsored or developed by business. Teachers and school staff need to be involved in the thinking, talking, and planning stages of a corporate-sponsored reform initiative. Schools cannot be reformed by well-meaning business, community, and university partners; they can only be reformed by hard-working educators with vision, a strategy, and support to make the strategy work. If teachers are partners in the development of a reform strategy, they are more likely to work toward its implementation and effectiveness.

Effective programs depend upon the school's capacity for change. In addition to faculty involvement, the success of reform initiatives depends upon three critical factors. First, school leaders and teachers must be well trained. Administrators, teachers, and staff need to learn new practices, attitudes, relationships, and roles; to succeed in the long-run, corporate-sponsored efforts should provide ongoing intensive staff development. Second, open communication must be established within the school system and between schools and the community. Faculty need to be kept informed of progress toward reform goals and reassured in their efforts

to change attitudes and behaviors to support student learning. In addition, parents and community members need information about and invitations to participate in the reform effort. And third, adequate resources must be available to support and promote change. Budget allocations made by superintendents and boards should be consistent with reform efforts.

Developing an Effective Education-Support Program

As companies seek to "make a difference" in education, they must also consider corporate interests as they:

1. Select an issue or issues to address.
2. Define the nature of the involvement or action they are able to undertake.
3. Decide which local, state, or national arena to work in.
4. Target where in the education system to work.

Planning Grid for Corporate Support of Education

Issues to Address	Type of Involvement	Arena for Action	Entry Points in the System
What fits corporate culture? What concerns employees? What do experts suggest? What issues do national reports address? What is the state education reform agenda?	What resources do we have to offer: money, people, material and equipment, advocacy? How much time can we put toward the effort? Are we able to staff the program? What is our budget?	Where can we have the most influence: nea: plant site, local school or district, urban or rural, or statewide? Where are we most needed? Where can we sustain involvement?	What do we want to accomplish? What kinds of activities do we want to support? Where in the system do we want to begin?

None of these four decisions is made in isolation from the others, of course, and which decision drives the others will differ among companies. The following Planning Grid may help program managers and education task forces develop an education-support program for their company. Each area on the grid will be discussed in the following section.

Underlying the planning process must be a focus on what the company hopes to achieve by its involvement and how it will gauge the success of its effort. Keeping a focus on outcomes, companies can better judge the effectiveness of their support for school-based reform or their commitment to helping schools attain higher levels of student achievement.

The effectiveness of corporate programs in education is further enhanced when internal corporate policies reflect and reinforce the goals of education reform.

Select Issue(s) to Address

Corporate support of education has traditionally been linked with a company's recruitment and hiring needs. As a result, many business-sponsored programs emphasize learning skills and competencies required in high-technology workplaces, and some companies are developing European-style apprenticeship programs for noncollege-bound students. **Siemens Corporation,** for example, has created three pilot programs at separate operating companies, each reflecting training needs at the site.

Some companies choose to focus on academic areas closely aligned to their corporate culture. **Hewlett-Packard, Rockwell International, Dow Chemical, Monsanto Corporation,** and **Eastman Kodak,** among others, have identified improving science education as a central goal of their corporate K-12 initiatives and support a number of different programs in that area. **Merck** went a step further and created the Merck Institute for Science Education, which promotes better student learning in science, directs teacher training programs, provides additional classroom resources and mentors, and supports statewide education reform in New Jersey and Pennsylvania. Other companies — like **E.I. du Pont de Nemours** and **Hoffmann-La Roche** — sponsor workshops to introduce high school science teachers to the latest technology and scientific breakthroughs.

Sometimes the motivation for developing a program in elementary and secondary education emerges from national reports or initiatives. **Champion International Corporation**, for instance, based its Middle School Partnership Program on the recommendations of a Carnegie Corporation report, *Turning Points: Preparing Youth for the 21st Century* (1989). The teaching of teachers at colleges and universities is undergoing major reform, developing out of John Goodlad's research.[12] **Exxon Education Foundation** and **Southwestern Bell Foundation** provide long-term support for implementation of Goodlad's recommendations, and both **AT&T Foundation** and **Philip Morris Companies** have funded major restructuring initiatives in teacher education.

[12] In *Teachers for Our Nation's Schools* (1990) Goodlad provides specific ideas that colleges and universities can use, as a blueprint, to guide the complete redesign of schools of education and their relationship to local schools and districts.

Believing that teachers were being bypassed by many existing reform initiatives, **Metropolitan Life Foundation** sponsors an annual Louis Harris poll to provide the current teaching force a voice on reform issues. **Southwestern Bell Foundation** and **Exxon Education Foundation** have been consistent supporters of Ted Sizer's work with the Coalition of Essential Schools; **Chevron USA Inc**. has helped elementary schools in California, Texas, and Louisiana implement major restructuring efforts based on Henry Levin's accelerated schools model; and **Kraft General Foods, Inc.** has introduced James Comer's School Development Program into several Chicago elementary schools.

BellSouth Corporation refocused its support of education in 1991 by creating five task forces of educators, consultants, and policymakers to examine promising approaches to improve learning; teaching; school governance, management, and organization; higher education; and the uses of technology in education. With the reports of these task forces, an advisory committee helped the **BellSouth Foundation** develop a comprehensive philanthropic approach to education reform. The Foundation issued a report, "Fulfilling Reform's Promise: The Need to Expand the Vision of Education in the South," that provided a blueprint for the corporation's involvement in education.

At times senior management's concern about issues in social policy leads to a shift in the focus of contributions and programs. James J. Renier, former Chairman and CEO of **Honeywell**, became a prominent advocate of improved education and health care for young children, and his commitment is reflected in funding priorities at Honeywell Foundation.

Determine Type of Involvement

Corporations need to be realistic about what types of involvement they can undertake in support of education reform: money, people, materials and equipment, advocacy, or a combination of these forms of support.

Cash contributions. When schools and districts think of lining up a "business partner," their intention is usually to get money from the company. Since schools prefer to decide how that money will be used, they may regard the company solely as a source of extra income and not as a knowledgeable partner in education reform. To take a more proactive role, companies need to create guidelines to help them decide which requests for funding match their priorities, and they need to establish an accountability system for each grant. Money from special grants can "jump start" restructuring by paying for services such as workshops and seminars on school change or for release time for teachers and staff to learn and plan, but it is advisable that companies also help schools and districts reallocate budgeted monies so reform strategies become institutionalized and do not remain dependent on outside sources.

Companies, like private foundations, can play an important role in framing reform issues through their grantmaking. Many corporations base grant allocations on "Requests for Proposals" (RFPs). Through an RFP process, the company can require grant applicants to meet the following criteria:[13]

1. They have clearly defined what they plan to do and what they expect to achieve, and they are able to provide research findings to substantiate the proposal.
2. They will focus their effort on the classroom and improving student learning and have built into the program an accountability system for teaching and learning.
3. The reform effort is realistically sustainable; the costs of the approach and its implementation are reasonable.
4. The effort ensures that the different needs of diverse students are met.
5. The effort complements existing reform efforts at the school site.

Companies can also use their grantmaking to support existing programs that have a track record of success, transplanting and adapting them for new communities and enabling successful programs to expand nationally.

Employee participation. Companies are often eager to invite employee involvement in their partnerships with schools. They encourage employees to volunteer as tutors and mentors working with students, as technical experts, as classroom aides for teachers, and as general support to office staff, librarians, school health clinics, and so forth. To launch a volunteer program, companies need to develop internal policies for employees at different levels within the company and establish guidelines on volunteering to coordinate activities between company and school. **General Electric Company's** premiere volunteer program, the Elfun Society, was established in 1928 and links volunteer GE employees and retirees with educational and community programs, often funded by the **General Electric Foundation**. Other companies are beginning to formalize volunteer programs for education reform. **Pennsylvania Power & Light**, for example, recently launched PP&L 2000, an all-volunteer effort to encourage employee support for elementary and secondary schools in its service region.

Involving employees in education reform extends beyond developing volunteer programs, however. **IBM, Xerox Corporation,** and other companies provide loaned executives for extended periods of time to work with schools, districts, and business/education coalitions.

Materials and equipment. Depending on local circumstances, companies can offer schools a wide variety of supplementary resources, including computer equipment, space for meetings and workshops, books and classroom supplies, transportation, field trips, and so forth. Technological gifts often require additional support, like helping schools install and maintain equipment and training school personnel on how to use the equipment effectively. In some cases, it may also be necessary to transform school space to accommodate the technology.

---

[1]These criteria have been proposed by the National Center to Improve the Tools of Educators as a means to evaluate reform strategies and ensure high quality innovations, in "Criteria for Funding Valid Educational Approaches," by Douglas Carnine (unpublished paper, 1993).

Gifts of materials and equipment will help schools move quickly into the world of technology, but companies need to combine these gifts with advice to help schools and districts redistribute money appropriately and establish line items in school budgets for technological purchases, so schools do not become dependent on the generosity of corporations.

Advocacy for policy-level changes in cities, states, and at the national level. By serving on state and national policy councils, many companies have been able to advocate high achievement standards for all students and support new policies and legislation that will promote systemwide education reform. In the state of Washington, for example, **The Boeing Company** played a key role on the Governor's Council on Education Reform and Funding, shaping education reform legislation and working for its passage in the legislature.

Corporations can also influence school reform agendas by building business/education coalitions that promote a general recognition of the need for change, examine education policy issues as they relate to school-based change, and provide links among existing partnership programs. **Air Products and Chemicals, Inc.**, for example, played a dominant role in developing business and community support for the Lehigh Valley Business-Education Partnership, dedicated to promoting activities that would bring businesses and schools together. As members have become more convinced of the need for a sustained education reform effort, they have reorganized and developed a new blueprint for action under the name Lehigh Valley 2000: A Business-Education Partnership. **Procter & Gamble**, in a similar way, has led the push for broad business, community, and education support of the Cincinnati Youth Collaborative, which combines opportunities for individual partnerships and volunteer activities with redesigning the district to promote school-based change.

In addition to supporting changes in education policy, many corporate leaders recognize the need to help community and state leaders address some of the critical societal problems that too often overwhelm schools such as poor health, poverty, unacceptable housing, drug use and violence.

Select Arena for Action

The decision about where to work is often strongly influenced by corporate presence. Most companies choose to develop their K-12 programs locally, close to plant sites. This proximity allows for employee involvement in the effort and benefits employee parents. **JCPenney** established its High Performance Schools Project in Fort Worth, TX, near its home base of Dallas, providing the district with easier access to technical support as well as financial help. **GTE** was able to offer expertise and advice in helping the Hillsborough County (Florida) School District transform routine management practices within individual schools and establish the foundation for changing interactions between schools and the district. (This tendency to work close to home, of course, does not benefit schools in communities where there is no strong local business presence, like inner cities and rural areas.)

Utility and telecommunication companies with state and regional operations often find it

beneficial to support schools in their broad service areas. For example, **Ameritech** and its member companies determined to focus on literacy in the Ameritech service area; the foundation selected Reading Is Fundamental and Junior Great Books as vehicles to help local children learn good reading skills. **U S WEST Foundation** launched an Early Childhood Education Initiative to support and create child care centers, Head Start programs, parent education and training, and other family support efforts in its 14 state region.

Only in rare cases do companies select partnership sites solely on reform criteria. **Panasonic Foundation's** Partnership Program is one example of a company working directly in communities and states not connected to the corporation's presence. When corporate involvement is predominantly in the form of cash contributions through an RFP process, the quality of the request usually determines selection. The **International Business Machines Corporation**, for example, funds a number of high impact implementation grants in schools, districts, and colleges across the country to support ongoing restructuring efforts and foster creative uses of technology in the classroom.

Through their support of the Business Roundtable Education Initiative, many large companies are dedicated to working on education reform in specific states. Some have chosen to fulfill their commitment through an individual project. **Shell Oil Company**, for example, developed the Louisiana Alliance for Education Reform with Tulane University and several school districts in the state. **Union Carbide Corporation**, on the other hand, led the way in creating Connecticut's statewide business/education coalition, which has played an important role in creating, developing, and promoting results-oriented reform for all elementary and secondary schools.

Identify Appropriate Entry Points

Knowing which issues it wants to address, the kinds of help it can offer to the education community, and the locale in which it wishes to work, a company then needs to decide where in the education system it can have the most impact. Possibilities for corporate involvement in each dimension of the system have been mentioned throughout this report and provide suggestions for the kinds of activities companies may want to undertake. There are benefits and drawbacks associated with involvement at each point within the system, and companies need to weigh those pros and cons as they determine how to put together a program in support of education reform.

The grid on page 42 outlines the major advantages and disadvantages of corporate involvement in each of the five dimensions of the education system discussed in this report.

Monitor & Evaluate Programs

School restructuring efforts attempt to change teaching and learning in the classroom and to create systems that promote such change. No corporate-sponsored program will, by itself, transform education. But no school undertaking restructuring can effectively juggle several

Entry Point	Pros	Cons
In the Classroom	Direct contact with students & teachers provides quick reinforcement with visible results in student attitudes & learning.	Classroom programs reach a small number of kids for limited time & have a limited impact on transforming the system.
In the School	Model & pilot projects can demonstrate what works in school reform. Staff development reaches a larger number of students through strengthened teacher skills.	Successful pilot programs are difficult to replicate in other settings. Positive learning experiences may not be reinforced when students move on to next level.
In the District	Allows a broader impact & coordinates reform within a network of schools through a feeder system of elementary, middle, & high schools.	Political & personal agendas of different divisions within the district derail many serious reform efforts.
In the Community	Serves community needs with special grants & personal contacts to change attitudes & practices among agencies & neighborhood resource centers.	Some may not understand the relationship between social problems & educational needs.
In the Policy Arena	Opportunities to challenge existing policy, rules & regulations and gain high visibility at state and national levels.	If not linked to building capacity at the local level, may not have much impact on changing things in classrooms and schools.

major reform projects simultaneously. Companies, therefore, need to find ways to support reform efforts directed toward building the capacity of educators to redesign their own classrooms, schools, and districts. Everyone involved needs to know "what works" — under what conditions, with what students, addressing what needs. Unfortunately, many of the education reform efforts now under way make no consistent effort to evaluate and assess what is being accomplished. The following guidelines may be helpful as companies try to add monitoring and evaluation components to their K-12 education programs.

Be realistic about program goals and the methods by which those goals will be reached. For example, if the strength of a company's effort is found in its employee volunteers, then the goal of the program might be to encourage students and assist them in specific courses. It is unlikely that this particular program will lead to systemic change, and such a goal will remain disappointingly out-of-reach. Understand also that some corporate initiatives may focus on the means to an end, not on reaching the end result itself. If the desired end result is increased student learning in key subject areas, but the program focuses primarily on building teacher capacity, the evaluation process too should focus on progress made in teacher development rather than on immediate improvements in student test scores.

At the beginning of the effort, conduct a survey or other quick analysis to measure the existing gap between current conditions and program goals. Without knowing how well the classroom or school is operating before the program takes effect, it will be hard to judge the impact of the program over time.

It is important to monitor progress toward goals as the program is under way. Through interviews, surveys, focus groups, and journals, participants should be encouraged to describe program aspects that are working well in addition to those areas that require additional attention and continued work.

Creating Corporate Policies that Support Education Reform

The policies and practices of business and industry can strongly influence the culture of the community within which they operate. Through hiring procedures, job training opportunities, employee relations, and government affairs activities, business leaders can develop internal corporate policies that reinforce their external commitment to quality education for all students.

Hiring policies. Companies can establish hiring policies that help students understand the importance of education by valuing the breadth and difficulty of courses taken as well as grades received. Companies can help schools collect and disseminate accurate data on students' schooling experiences so personnel offices can use the information in decisionmaking. Ideally, companies can develop structured work apprenticeship programs that link academic courses with on-the-job experiences to effectively prepare students for the workplace.

Employee parents. Through internal publications, workshops, and promotions, companies can help parent-employees understand education issues and their responsibility for their children's education. Companies can urge parental involvement in schools by creating flex-time and other policies that permit school visits and by providing paid leave for parents to participate in school activities.

Education leadership roles. By providing information about education issues, leadership training opportunities, and technical assistance, companies can encourage employees to serve

on local and state education task forces, to run for positions on the school board, and to become active in the local schools.

Legislative policy. Corporate lobbyists need to be informed on education issues and understand the corporate stake in education so they can advocate for education reforms at state and national levels.

Opportunities for business to sustain education reform come from rethinking the role of business. Most reform advocates acknowledge that simple "adopt-a-school" and "helping hands" partnerships are not going to generate change, but neither can companies afford to believe that creating and supporting innovative programs will automatically lead to school-based change. When classroom reforms, introduced by innovation, are also supported by changes within schools, districts, communities, and education policy, then we will begin to transform the system so that each child has the opportunity to achieve an excellent education.

For Further Reading

The Business Roundtable Participation Guide: A Primer for Business on Education. Washington, DC: National Alliance of Business, 1990. See especially Chapter 5, "Management and Decision-Making: How They're Changing," pp. 25–33.

Chubb, John E. and Terry M. Moe. *Politics, Markets, and America's Schools.* Washington, DC: Brookings Institution, 1990.

Conley, David T. *Roadmap to Restructuring: Policies, Practices, and the Emerging Visions of Schooling.* Eugene, OR: Eric Clearinghouse on Educational Management, 1993.

Danzberger, Jacqueline P., Michael W. Kirst, and Michael D. Usdan. *Governing Public Schools: New Times, New Requirements.* Washington, DC: Institute for Educational Leadership, 1992.

David, Jane C. and Paul D. Green. *Transforming Education: Overcoming Barriers.* Washington, DC: National Governors' Association, 1993.

de Lone, Richard H. *The Business Leader's Guide to Partnerships for Education Reform: A Strategic Perspective.* Philadelphia, PA: Public/Private Ventures, 1992.

Elmore, Richard F. and associates, eds. *Restructuring Schools: The Next Generation of Educational Reform.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 1991.

Essential Components of a Successful Education System: Putting Policy into Practice. Washington, DC: Business Roundtable, 1992.

Farkas, Steve. *Divided Within, Besieged Without: The Politics of Education in Four American School Districts.* New York, NY: Public Agenda Foundation, 1993.

Fiske, Edward B. *Smart Schools, Smart Kids: Why Do Some Schools Work?* New York, NY: Simon & Schuster, 1991.

Fullan, Michael G. with Suzanne Stiegelbauer. *The New Meaning of Educational Change,* 2nd ed. New York, NY: Teachers College Press, 1991.

Fullan, Michael G. and Matthew B. Miles. "Getting Reform Right: What Works and What Doesn't." *Phi Delta Kappan* (June 1992), 745–752.

Goodlad, John I. *Teachers for Our Nation's Schools.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 1990.

Hill, Paul T. *Urban Education.* RAND RP-178. Santa Monica, CA: RAND, 1993. Reprinted from *Urban America,* James B. Steeberg, David W. Lyon, and Mary E. Viana, eds. RAND MR-100-RC. Santa Monica, CA: RAND, 1992.

Kozol, Jonathan. *Savage Inequalities: Children in America's Schools.* New York, NY: Crown, 1991.

McLaughlin, Milbrey W. "The Rand Change Agent Study Revisited: Macro Perspectives and Micro Realities." *Educational Researcher* (December 1990), 11-16.

Making Schools Work for Children in Poverty: A New Framework Prepared by the Commission on Chapter 1. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education, 1992.

Marburger, Carl L. *One School at a Time: School Based Management, A Process for Change.* Columbia, MD: National Committee for Citizens in Education, 1985.

Marshall, Ray and Marc Tucker. *Thinking for a Living: Education and the Wealth of Nations.* New York, NY: Basic Books, 1992.

Melaville, Atelia I. and Martin J. Blank. *Together We Can: A Guide for Crafting a Profamily System of Education and Human Services.* A joint publication of the U.S. Department of Education and the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1993.

Sarason, S.B. *The Culture of the School and the Problem of Change.* Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon, 1971.

Schlechty, Phillip C. *Schools for the 21st Century.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 1990.

Schmoker, Michael J. and Richard B. Wilson. *Total Quality Education: Profiles of Schools that Demonstrate the Power of Deming's Management Principles.* Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa, 1993.

Senge, Peter M. *The Fifth Discipline: The Art and Practice of the Learning Organization.* New York, NY: Doubleday, 1992.

Sizer, Theodore R. *Horace's School: Redesigning the American High School.* Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin, 1992.

Transforming Our Schools: Lessons from the Jefferson County Public Schools/Gheens Professional Development Academy, 1983-1991. Louisville, KY: Gheens Foundation, 1993.

Turning Points: Preparing American Youth for the 21st Century. The Report of the Task Force on Education of Young Adolescents. New York, NY: Carnegie Corporation, 1989.

Resource Organizations

For Information on Business/School Interactions

The Council for Aid to Education is a resource for companies and others interested in making effective contributions to the quality of American precollege and higher education. For additional information, contact:

Council for Aid to Education
51 Madison Avenue, Suite 2200
New York, NY 10010
212/689-2400
Diana W. Rigden, Vice President, Precollege Programs

Business Roundtable
1615 L Street NW, Suite 1350
Washington, DC 20036
202/872-1260
Christopher Cross, Executive Director, Education Initiatives

Center for Corporate & Education Initiatives
Health Institute — New England Medical Center
750 Washington Street, NEMCH #328
Boston, MA 02111
617/956-9151
William Bloomfield, Director

Center for Excellence in Education
National Alliance of Business
1201 New York Avenue NW, Suite 700
Washington, DC 20005
202/289-2962
Patricia Mitchell, Vice President and Executive Director

Center for Workforce Preparation & Quality Education
U.S. Chamber of Commerce
1615 H Street NW
Washington, DC 20062
202/463-5525
Rae Nelson, Executive Director

Committee for Economic Development
477 Madison Avenue
New York, NY 10022
212/688-2063
Sandra Hamburg, Vice President, Director of Education Studies

Conference Board
Business/Education Council
845 Third Avenue
New York, NY 10022
212/759-0900

Council on Foundations
1828 L Street NW
Washington, DC 20036
202/466-6512
Mary K. Leonard, Director, Precollegiate Education Programs

Edison Electric Institute
701 Pennsylvania Avenue NW
Washington, DC 20004-2696
202/508-5591
Walter Purdy, Director, Educational Services

Education Commission of the States
707 17th Street, Suite 2700
Denver, CO 80202-3427
303/299-3611
Frank Newman, President

Educational Publishing Group, Inc.
376 Boylston Street
Boston, MA 02116
617/424-6500
Jonathan Carlson, President and Publisher

Home and School Institute, Inc.
1201 16th Street NW
Washington, DC 20036
202/466-3633
Dorothy Rich, President

National Association for Industry-Education Cooperation
235 Hendricks Boulevard
Buffalo, NY 14266
716/834-7047
Donald Clark, President

National Association of Partners in Education
209 Madison Avenue, Suite 401
Alexandria, VA 22314
703/836-4880
Daniel Merenda, Executive Director

National Committee for Citizens in Education
900 2nd Street NW Suite 8
Washington, DC 20002-3557
202/408-0447
Bruce Astrein, Executive Director

New American Schools Development Corporation
1000 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 2710
Arlington, VA 22209
703/908-9500
John Anderson, President

Public Education Fund Network
601 13th Street NW, Suite 370S
Washington, DC 20005
202/628-7460
Wendy Puriefoy, President

Public/Private Ventures
2005 Market Street, Suite 900
Philadelphia, PA 19103
215/557-4400
Thomas J. Smith, Vice President, Director of External Affairs

Triangle Coalition for Science and Technology
5112 Berwyn Road
College Park, MD 20740
301/220-0872
John Fowler, Director

Work/Family Directions, Inc.
930 Commonwealth Avenue West
Boston, MA 02215-1212
617/278-4000
Fran Sussner Rodgers, President

Precollege Advisory Board

Robert C. Allen, District Manager, Charlotte Area
Duke Power Company

Michael Bivens, Education Director
Coca-Cola Foundation

Emelda Cathcart, Director, Corporate Contributions
Time Warner Inc.

Charles O. DeRiemer, Executive Director
Southwestern Bell Foundation

Susan J. Driggers, Education Relations Director
BellSouth Telecommunications

David S. Ford, Vice President, Director of Philanthropy
Chase Manhattan Bank N.A.

Richard Green, Director of Apprenticeships
Honeywell, Inc.

F. James Hoffmann, Executive Director
Middle School Partnership Program
Champion International Corporation

Cheryl Kubelick, Manager, Contributions & Community Affairs
Westinghouse Electric Corporation

Mary E. Leslie, Executive Director
Pacific Telesis Foundation

William C. Linder-Scholer, Director, Community Affairs, and Executive Director
Cray Research Foundation

Phyllis S. McGrath, Manager, Precollege Programs
General Electric Foundation

John L. Mason, President
Monsanto Fund

Samuel M. Matsa, Program Manager, Corporate Support Programs
International Business Machines Corporation

Westina Matthews, Vice President, Philanthropic Programs
Merrill Lynch & Co., Inc.

Jacqueline R. Millan, Manager, Corporate Contributions
PepsiCo, Inc.

Virginia Millan, Program Associate, Education Programs
Metropolitan Life Foundation

Gloria Moritz, Senior Community Affairs Representative
Tenneco Gas

Jane J. Prancan, Executive Director
U S WEST Foundation

Sophie Sa, Executive Director
Panasonic Foundation

Elizabeth Share, Vice President
Autodesk Foundation

Bess Stephens, Education Relations Manager
Hewlett-Packard Company

Sustaining Change in Schools: A Role for Business*

Business leaders and educators working toward school reform are beginning to understand that to reach the national education goals we seek, we need to work simultaneously at several levels within the education system. When we initiate school-based, teacher-focused, and classroom-centered reforms, we also must be aware of local realities such as time constraints, lack of resources, faculty factions, and regulatory requirements. Reforms in education policy need to be developed and established in tandem with school-based change efforts, so those policies support and undergird local action.

Having demonstrated a commitment to quality education by staying the course for a decade, business leaders are in a unique position to help guide and sustain long-term change in the schools. Businesses and schools have developed a level of mutual trust over the decade, and can now begin to leverage the changes created in specific classrooms and individual schools by extending reform outward into the district and state. Innovation in the classroom, the central feature of many partnership programs, will survive and flourish only within a supportive and flexible system.

Developing An Effective Education-Support Program

As companies seek to "make a difference" in education, they must also consider corporate interests as they:

1) select an issue or issues to address;

2) define the nature of the involvement or action they are able to undertake;

3) decide which local, state, or national arena to work in; and

4) target where in the education system to work.

None of these four decisions is made in isolation from the others, of course, and which decision drives the others will vary among companies. The following Planning Grid may help program managers and education task forces develop an education-support program for their company.

*The ideas and information presented here are excerpted from a recent report, *Sustaining Change in Schools: A Role for Business*, available from the Council for Aid to Education.

See order form on back panel.

Key Elements of Successful Reform

When the prevailing attitude is "all kids can learn," the school works to ensure that each child has the opportunity and means to succeed. To create such a school culture and extend it throughout the system, key reforms must occur within five distinct dimensions of education:

■ Within each *classroom*, reform focuses on meaningful curriculum and use of technology, the quality of instruction by knowledgeable and dedicated teachers, and student mastery of knowledge and skills.

■ At the *school* site, reform is based on a mission that focuses on student learning and seeks high academic achievement for all students. Reform is guided by flexible, strong leaders who practice school-based management procedures. Decisions about scheduling, the acquisition of equipment and materials, and the use and maintenance of facilities are designed to enhance the quality of teaching and learning.

■ *District* level leaders establish flexible policies and procedures to promote and encourage school-based change and innovation. They develop assessment strategies that effectively measure not only whether students meet high standards but also how well schools educate all their students, and they create communication and resource networks for the schools.

■ A network of support within the *community* is evident through a shared consensus for reform that leads to collaborative relations between families and schools and the linkage of community services to school needs.

■ Finally, new educational *policies* are established to scrap regulations that inhibit reform, foster outcome-based strategies with new assessment tools to measure successful learning, and ensure adequate educational opportunities for all students.

Dimension	Focus of Reform
CLASSROOM	Developmental needs of students. Core curriculum & technology use. Quality instruction by knowledgeable & dedicated teachers. Student mastery of knowledge & skills.
SCHOOL	Mission of student learning & high academic achievement for all students. Flexible, strong leadership. School-based management process centered on teaching & learning.
DISTRICT	School-based change process. Assessment/accountability procedures. Communication & resource networks.
COMMUNITY	Building consensus for reform. Collaboration between families & schools. Linking social services & schools.
POLICY	Outcome-based education reform. Replacing regulations with technical support. Ensuring adequate opportunities for all students.

© Council for Aid to Education

Planning Grid For Corporate Support Of Education			
ISSUES TO ADDRESS What fits corporate culture? What concerns employees? What do experts suggest? What issues do national reports address? What is the state education reform agenda?	TYPE OF INVOLVEMENT What resources do we have to offer: money, people, material and equipment, advocacy? How much time can we put toward the effort? Are we able to staff the program? What is our budget?	ARENA FOR ACTION What do we want to accomplish? What kinds of activities do we want to support? Where in the system do we want to begin?	ENTRY POINTS IN THE SYSTEM Where can we have the most influence: near plant site, local school or district, urban or rural, or statewide? Where are we most needed? Where can we sustain involvement?

Underlying the planning process must be a focus on what the company hopes to achieve by its involvement and how it will gauge the success of its effort. Keeping a focus on outcomes, companies can better judge the effectiveness of their support for school-based reform or their commitment to helping schools attain higher levels of student achievement.

The effectiveness of corporate programs in education is further enhanced when internal corporate policies reflect and reinforce the goals of education reform.

© Council for Aid to Education

Strategies for Involvement in Systemic Education Reform

...In the Classroom

Focus of Reform	Possible Company Involvement		
	Money	**Human & Material Resources**	**Advocacy**
CURRICULUM-DRIVEN REFORM	Support curriculum projects that focus on core subjects. Provide incentive grants to help redesign schools for use of technology	Train teachers & students on computers & use of technology. Speak to classes on applications of subject-area knowledge. Provide equipment & classroom materials. Advise on reallocation of funds to support high tech & distance learning.	Support establishment of state learning outcomes & advocate high achievement standards. Advocate research-based redesign of education materials.
ENHANCING TEACHER CAPACITY	Send teachers to summer institutes and/or graduate courses in subject areas. Fund teacher visits to restructuring schools. Provide minigrants to promote teacher innovation.	Invite teachers into company for job-related experiences. Volunteer as classroom aides. Advise & consult with teachers on how to implement reforms. Provide basic office equipment for teachers (telephones, voice mail, modems, computers, printers, copiers, etc.). Provide ongoing support for staff development.	Support teaching certification standards for all teachers. Advocate creative reform of colleges of teacher education.
MOTIVATING STUDENTS FOR LEARNING	Fund & develop after-school programs in core subject areas. Provide scholarships & other incentives for academic success.	Tutor students in core subject areas to reach high achievement standards. Mentor students in career possibilities & future opportunities. Provide classroom tools such as calculators, networking technology, multimedia resources, etc. Help schools establish home use of computers linked to schools.	Advocate funding for early childhood programs. Support student learning outcomes & high achievement standards.

© Council for Aid to Education

...In the School

Focus of Reform	Possible Company Involvement		
	Money	**Human & Material Resources**	**Advocacy**
SCHOOL MISSION & LEARNING OUTCOMES	Host retreats for full staff.	Facilitate regularly-scheduled workshops. Provide books, videos, consultants, and other resources.	Promote student learning outcomes. Advocate high achievement standards.
LEADERSHIP FOR CHANGE	Send administrators to summer institutes & training programs. Host follow-up workshops for administrators.	Train staff in defining mission and goals, developing strategic and implementation plans. Provide consultants and advisors to principals and district leaders.	Support school leaders at school board meetings.
MANAGING THE CHANGE PROCESS	Sponsor management training workshops for teachers & administrators. Provide implementation & incentive grants for school-based management reforms. Fund site visits for teachers & administrators to reforming schools.	Provide on-site consultants & advisors to help faculty, staff, & administrators develop new management styles. Volunteer to assist & support school-based councils. Set up computer networks for management. Facilitate development of self-evaluation tools to assess progress. Help develop communication strategy to inform community on new structures.	Advocate school-based decisionmaking. Advocate school-based control of funding & budget.

© Council for Aid to Education

...In the District

Focus of Reform	Possible Company Involvement		
	Money	**Human & Material Resources**	**Advocacy**
SUPPORT FOR SCHOOL-BASED RESTRUCTURING	Host board retreats to develop district reform plan. Help establish focused staff development program.	Provide consultants to work with district leaders. Serve on superintendent's reform advisory boards.	Support school-based reforms leading to high student achievement. Support school-board policies designed to institutionalize continuous improvement.
STUDENT ASSESSMENT & SCHOOL ACCOUNTABILITY	Support comparative studies and visits with other districts.	Consult, advise, and help set up data collection and analysis systems to track student achievement. Help district analyze individual school needs in implementing reforms.	Advocate school & faculty accountability linked with financial & technical support.
SETTING UP COMMUNICATION & RESOURCE NETWORKS	Survey faculty, staff, students, & parents about in-district communication. Help establish district-wide resource network.	Help develop communication plans within districts, between schools and families, and with general public. Provide necessary technical support communication strategies — telephones, copy machines, faxes, modems, etc.	Encourage board communication with public on reform vision.

© Council for Aid to Education

...In the Community

Focus of Reform	Possible Company Involvement		
	Money	**Human & Material Resources**	**Advocacy**
BUILDING A CONSENSUS FOR REFORM	Sponsor town meetings to discuss education issues. Sponsor special education supplements in newspaper.	Canvas community to identify educational needs & priorities. Establish community-wide coalitions for education.	Advocate for high quality community programs to support learning, especially in core subjects: reading, science, math, and technology.
CONNECTING FAMILIES & SCHOOLS	Host functions to create bonds between schools & families.	Advise employee-parents on ways to support learning. Help families create space & time for school-related activities. Help schools develop creative ways to communicate & collaborate with families.	Advocate family-centered policy.
LINKING SOCIAL SERVICES WITH SCHOOLS	Support programs to train parents as child's first teacher. Provide incentive grants to encourage agency cooperation. Support community-based centers for child care, teenagers, adult literacy.	Help develop volunteer and community service programs for students. Serve as mentors for students participating in social programs (drug & violence awareness, etc.). Institute preschool and day care centers at or near school sites.	Promote close ties between health and social agencies & school boards. Lobby for funding for early childhood & health care programs.

© Council for Aid to Education

...In the Policy Arena

Focus of Reform	Possible Company Involvement		
	Money	**Human & Material Resources**	**Advocacy**
ESTABLISHING OUTCOME-BASED EDUCATION REFORMS	Provide incentive grants for implementing reforms.	Help schools & districts develop implementation plans for outcome-based reforms. Link partnership programs to outcome-based reform strategies.	Advocate outcome-based education reform in community & company. Support accompanying legislation & state funding for reform.
REASSESSING RULES & REGULATIONS	Fund research on effective implementation of reform.	Help school councils identify regulations that hinder change and "run interference" for them at district and state levels.	Lobby for legislative changes to shift from program focus to school-based efforts.
ENSURING ADEQUATE EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES	Fund an assessment of schools' physical needs. Provide matching funds for repairs & upgrades. Help schools meet matching fund requirements for state equipment grants.	Volunteer time to rewire, repair, rebuild classrooms & schools. Manage volunteer repair & maintenance effort. Help communicate physical plant needs to community. Provide technological equipment & distance learning capability.	Advocate & lobby for tax levies earmarked for plant improvements. Support changes in school maintenance contracts. Lobby legislature for building fund allocations.

© Council for Aid to Education

COMMENT: Opportunities for business to sustain education reform come from rethinking the role of business. Most reform advocates acknowledge that simple "adopt-a-school" and "helping hands" partnerships are not going to generate change, but neither can companies afford to believe that creating and supporting innovative programs will automatically lead to school-based change. When classroom efforts, introduced by innovation, are also supported by changes within schools, districts, communities, and education policy, then we will begin to transform the system so that each child has the opportunity to achieve an excellent education.

Order Form

Orders received on a copy of this order form will be filled at a *special 20% discount.*

Please send the following Council publications:

QTY	TITLE	PRICE
_____	*Sustaining Change in Schools* @ $20 each (list price $25)	_____
_____	*School Restructuring* @ $20 each (list price $25)	_____
_____	*Business/School Partnerships* @ $20 each (list price $25)	_____
_____	*Business and the Schools, 2nd ed.* @ $28 each (list price $35)	_____

I have enclosed a check in the amount of $_____
(please include **$3 per copy** for postage and handling).

NOTE: Only prepaid orders will be honored; no purchase orders. No refunds, no returns. For shipment via a private air express company send a self-addressed air bill and your account number with this form and payment.

SHIP TO:

Name _____

Title _____

Affiliation _____

Street _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____

Telephone _____

Please return this order form with payment to:

Council for Aid to Education
51 Madison Avenue, Suite 2200
New York, NY 10010

(EIN 13-1687263)

COUNCIL FOR AID TO EDUCATION

51 Madison Avenue
Suite 2200
New York, New York 10010
212/689-2400

COUNCIL FOR AID TO EDUCATION

51 Madison Avenue
Suite 2200
New York, New York 10010

BEST COPY AVAILABLE